

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

IN the *International Journal of Ethics* for July there is an article by a 'neutral.' The author is a woman. Since the war began she has travelled in Germany and she has travelled in England. And in both these countries she has been impressed by one thing. Men and women will not be persuaded to believe that which they wish not to believe. 'Try to convince a German that the *Lusitania* was unarmed and carried no troops, or an Englishman that Allied submarines have sunk without warning unarmed merchant ships carrying women and children in the Sea of Marmora. You will see how fiercely the closed mind protects its own exclusiveness, attacking not only the unpleasant information but its innocent bearer.'

So this clever American woman, whose name is Gertrude Besse KING, has returned home, satisfied that the only attitude for a philosophical mind is neutrality. She has returned home to the United States of America where she will find many who are neither pro-German nor pro-British, and to whom neutrality is the only right attitude. Bearing no unpleasant information, the innocent bearer will fear no injury.

And yet there are those in the United States of America who are disturbed about neutrality. They are disturbed because everything is known by its fruits, and the fruits of neutrality have not been

good. In the American *Expositor* for September there is an article by a citizen of the United States, the Rev. Charles S. MACFARLAND, D.D., on 'The Moral Effect of the War upon America.' The article has the first place in the *Expositor*. This is the first sentence of it: 'Recent experiences in Europe may have led to over emphasis, but I am constrained to the feeling that the moral effect of this war upon America may be worse than upon any of the nations involved.'

Why does Dr. MACFARLAND say that? Because of neutrality. 'Among the belligerent peoples,' he says, 'there are compensatory influences for its awful tragedies. One witnesses examples of splendid bravery and self-sacrifice, the spirit of both patriotic devotion and Christian resignation on the part of widows and children, of allegiance to conscience, the willingness of the rich to share with the poor, the deepening of the religious sense, which in some cases has risen to a spiritual atmosphere far above the conflict, the sense of a sublime faith in the future, in some cases the discrediting of militarism, at times the spirit of intercession, and many other moral and spiritual elements which, perhaps, go far to counteract the demoralizing influences of human strife. Many or most of these elements are wanting in the moral atmosphere of our country.'

Of these elements he selects one for particular attention. It is the loss of compassion. 'We have become "used to it,"' he says, 'until the massacre of a nation has little more effect upon us than had the sinking of the *Titanic* with a thousand souls but four short years ago.'

And then comes this terrible paragraph: 'For Belgium and her three million destitute and starving people we have given seven cents per capita, while New Zealand, bearing its own war burdens as part of the British Empire, has given a dollar and a quarter per capita to Belgian relief. England, staggering under the war load, has received and cared for thousands of Belgian refugees, and given millions of pounds besides. It was thought that the United States, the only great nation untouched by the war, might furnish the food supplies for Belgium, but the Commission was obliged to ask food from the whole world to save Belgium from starvation. It must be remembered, also, that the gifts to Belgium from our country include the large contributions of the Rockefeller Foundation, so that the total of popular contributions is smaller than appears. For Servia, with her five millions of suffering peoples and her five thousand orphans, we have given less than three hundred thousand dollars, while the British Serbian Relief Committee three months ago had raised a million and a half pounds (\$7,500,000), and France two million francs (\$400,000). To the more than one million Armenians, whose story forms one of the darkest chapters in human history, we have given, covering the whole period, about one dollar for each sufferer. For the sufferers in Northern France little or nothing, and for Poland's millions of homeless, wandering peasants, mostly women and children, a total of something like two hundred thousand dollars.'

It is a terrible paragraph, we say. We could not have written it if we would; we would not have written it if we could. But as we read it we see that neutrality is not the bravest thing or the best.

Blow, bugles, blow! They brought us, for our dearth,

Holiness, lacked so long, and Love, and Pain.
Honour has come back, as a king, to earth,
And paid his subjects with a royal wage;
And Nobleness walks in our ways again;
And we have come into our heritage.

The Swarthmore Lecture is delivered every year on the evening preceding the assembly of the Friends' Yearly Meeting. The lecturer for 1916 was Henry T. HODGKIN, M.A., M.B. Mr. HODGKIN was sometime missionary in West China. As the subject of lecture he chose *The Missionary Spirit and the Present Opportunity* (Headley; 1s. net).

The choice was natural. Was it not a little untimely? We are not interested in missions just now; we are interested in war. Have not the missionaries been told to hold their hand for a time? Have not some of them been interned? The proclamation of the grace of God in Christ—must it not wait until we have won the war?

But Mr. HODGKIN seems to think that his lecture will show us the way to win the war. He says nothing about interned missionaries or suspended missions. He speaks only of the possession of the missionary spirit. And he does so because he seems to think that the nations which have the missionary spirit and have it most abundantly are the nations which are most likely to end the war victoriously.

It is true that Mr. HODGKIN is a Quaker. And being a Quaker he conceives it to be his duty to abstain from war. But that does not prevent him from seeing that there are worse things on earth than war. It does not prevent him from seeing that God may make use of war, although it is a bad thing, to get rid of things that are worse.

Now if God uses war in order to get rid of things

that are worse than war, He will see to it that those nations win the war who, as the result of it, will put away these things from their midst. And the nations that are most likely to put away these things from their midst are the nations who have most of the missionary spirit.

What are the things that have to be put away? The first thing that Mr. HODGKIN mentions is the habit of shelving God. This habit has grown upon us. It began when we first allowed scientific investigators to say that nature does not need a God. It began with the discovery of Evolution. When Evolution was discovered it was said that matter has within itself the faculty of steadily beating its own best record. It needs no impulse from Spirit. Then the approach of God, even to man, was spoken of as 'interference.' And it was said, with scornful confidence, that there is no use for a God who interferes with the order of nature.

We must get rid of the habit of shelving God. The war must help us to get rid of it. We must believe once again that God is, and that He is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him. We must believe in prayer. We had come to look upon prayer as a possibly commendable act of devotion for those who were inclined that way. But we hesitated to ask for anything in prayer, lest we should upset the 'laws of nature.'

Mr. HODGKIN seems to think that it would be better to blaspheme God than to shelve Him. Now the war in its progress has been the occasion of much rough language about God. And it does not seem that the Christian conscience altogether condemns it. Perhaps we all agree already that it is better to use strong language when speaking about God than never to speak or think of Him at all.

Another thing which we have to put away is selfish and merciless competition. Mr. HODGKIN does not altogether refuse a place to competition.

He is aware that there is an injunction laid on us to provoke one another to love and to good works. For there is a rivalry that is good and there is a rivalry that is evil. The rivalry that is evil seeks our own prosperity at the expense of our neighbour's; the rivalry that is good finds the prosperity of one in the prosperity of all.

Is the war to bring us back to the rivalry of love and good works? It has brought us back already. Who are they who have done most for the countries that have suffered in the war? It is the nations that are bearing the burden of it. There is a deep pit dug between the forces that are opposed to one another, a pit filled with hatred and revenge, which it will take a long time to fill up. But a great discovery has been made by those nations which are fighting on the same side. It is the discovery that co-operation is better than individual action. It is the discovery that through prayer and self-sacrifice this whole world may be bound by gold chains about the feet of God. And that discovery will remain with us when the enmity between the contending powers has passed away.

There is another thing which the nations that possess the missionary spirit must put away. It is their security. For it is not self-indulgence that is destroying the nations, it is security. 'When Christ demanded the great surrender from the rich young man, He was in reality calling him not so much into a life of poverty as into one of adventure. What He saw was a man utterly secure in his habitual observance of the law and in his well-appointed, comfortable home. "How hard it is," He said, "for them that trust in riches to enter into the Kingdom of God." How hard it is, we might add, for them that have riches not to trust in them. All unconsciously the sense of security wraps us round. We pass day after day in a well-ordered routine, never feeling any need to pray for our daily bread. We scarcely ever face a situation in which we should be utterly helpless without God. The more sure we are of drawing our dividends, the less do we need to draw on the divine resources.

And so we go on complacently until the unexpected suddenly happens, as this war happened; the Son of Man comes like a thief in the night; our sense of security is shattered, our possessions gone, and, facing the great Disturber of our peace, we find ourselves naked and ashamed.'

Will the war help us out of our sense of security? It has done so already. If it has done anything at all for us it has done that. It has done that for nearly all of us. It sent us out on an adventure at once, though it took us some time to find out how tremendous an adventure it was.

Are we to settle down in security again when the war is over? That will be difficult. God will see to it that it is made difficult. If the war has come upon us in order that we may put away from us the things that are worse than war, the war will not come to an end until we are ready to put away security. For war is too evil in itself to be used of God for little good.

A notable book has been published under the title of *The Divine Aspect of History* (Cambridge: At the University Press; 2 vols., 36s. net). It is notable on account of the publishing house which issues it. It is notable on account of its author, who bears the name of John Rickards MOZLEY, and calls John Henry Newman uncle. And it is notable in itself.

The Prologue to the Fourth Gospel is a history of the world. It is a history of the world by one who stands beside God and looks down upon it. This also is a history of the world. But it is a history of the world by one who keeps pace with God at work within it. He is therefore a believer in the Supernatural. He is so whole-hearted a believer in the Supernatural that for him there is no natural. God is in all life. Men have not seen God always in their life; or when they recorded their experiences they have not always given God His place in them, so that there is history without

the recognition of God. Mr. MOZLEY sets such history aside. He is concerned with the history, whether of Babylonia and Persia, or Greece and Rome, or Israel and Christianity, which recognizes that men live and move and have their being in God.

He is so thorough a believer in the Supernatural that he does not believe in miracle. He means by miracle what most of us mean by it—an occasional entrance of God, or the power of God, into life, beyond His ordinary working. Mr. MOZLEY does not believe that God ever enters, or ever has entered, into life in that way. He has had no need. He is always in life.

It is true that some of the documents in which Mr. MOZLEY finds his history in its divine aspect contain the record of miracles wrought by God or by the power of God. And the very best of these records, the four Gospels, contain the greatest number of miracles. He is not a little puzzled to find it so. He is still more puzzled to know how to get rid of the miracles and retain the Gospels.

For as soon as the miracle is removed the narrative in which it is embedded hangs in the air. Nevertheless Mr. MOZLEY believes that all the miracles can be got rid of, except the miracles of healing. And the miracles of healing need not be called miracles. Jesus had exceptional psychical power, or people then were exceptionally susceptible to psychical influence. Did He not always demand faith before He healed? Is it not said that 'He could do no miracle there because of their unbelief'? And what is faith but psychical susceptibility?

Is the raising of the dead a miracle of healing? Mr. MOZLEY does not think so. It is true that Jesus mentioned the raising of the dead along with miracles of healing in His reply to the messengers of John the Baptist. 'Go your way and tell John the things which ye do hear and see: the blind receive their sight, and the lame walk, the lepers

are cleansed, and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have good tidings preached to them. And blessed is he; whosoever shall not be offended in me' (Mt 11⁴⁻⁶). Mr. MOZLEY is much impressed by that passage. It is 'the most remarkable assertion by Jesus of his own deeds which the three earlier gospels contain.' And he points out, very properly, that in that passage Jesus lays stress, not on the wonder of His works, but on their beneficence. That is clear from the clause in which the affirmation of His deeds culminates: 'the poor have the gospel preached to them.' But the raising of the dead is a difficulty. If it did not occur, why is it thrown in along with things which did occur? Mr. MOZLEY concludes that in that example Jesus was speaking metaphorically. He quotes the words 'Let the dead bury their dead' to show that He did sometimes speak metaphorically of the dead. And so He did. But He spoke metaphorically also of the blind and the deaf.

Since Mr. MOZLEY does not believe that Jesus raised any one from the dead, we shall not expect him to believe that He rose from the dead Himself. But if we come to that conclusion hurriedly we may do him a serious injustice. It is quite true that he does not believe in the resurrection of the body of Jesus from the dead, but he does believe in the resurrection of His soul.

How does Mr. MOZLEY show that Jesus did not rise from the dead in the body? By showing that the resurrection narratives in the Gospels are inconsistent. But he says at once, 'My object in doing so is not to deny the truth or the importance of the belief expressed in the words, "Christ is risen," but to show that the event thus indicated belonged to the spiritual world and not to the world discerned by our ordinary senses; from which it will follow that the resurrection, when rightly understood, was not a miracle, but that it implies a new kind of perception on our part, the perception of a world higher than the world of sense.'

This is not quite easy to understand. How is the perception of a world higher than the world of sense a new kind of perception on our part? Mr. MOZLEY seems to mean that it was by His resurrection—His spiritual resurrection—that Jesus brought life and immortality to light. He rose in spirit and remained alive. In the spiritual state He was able to communicate with those whom He left behind upon the earth. He communicated so with Saul of Tarsus. That communication gave His followers the certainty of a spiritual world 'higher than the world of sense.'

And that spiritual communion which the risen Lord now established between Himself and His followers on earth is the source of all the strength which belief in the Resurrection gave to the early Church. The resurrection of the body would have been nothing. As soon as the Church adopted that incredible dogma, says Mr. MOZLEY, weakness set in. The uniqueness and the power of Jesus consist in this that He first, and He only, rose from the dead and continued to live, a spiritual presence in heaven, able to communicate with His disciples on earth and to strengthen them to overcome the world.

Mr. MOZLEY does not believe in miracle, and therefore he does not believe in the bodily resurrection of Jesus. He does not believe in miracle, and therefore he does not believe that Jesus was more than man. But if He was the first to rise from the dead in spirit, and by rising was able to 'shed forth this which ye now see and hear,' He must have been a most remarkable man. What does Mr. MOZLEY say about Him? He says, 'He was the man who first received, as his own proper inheritance, the Divine Spirit and Power in its fullness; and those who receive it after him have been helped by him either through his direct influence upon them, or by influences indirectly due to him; or, if they have stood altogether outside his influence (as is generally the case with Mohammedans), they have been unable to bring their goodness to permanent and ever-

increasing fruitage. The progress of mankind is founded on him in a unique sense. This makes him greater than his fellow-men; but it does not make him outside the range of comparison with them.'

'Two parsons were talking earnestly together close beside me. They were discussing an excellent layman, whom they both admired for his great qualities and his blameless life. "But is he a Christian?" said the first. "Well," said my other neighbour, "it all depends upon what you mean by a Christian." "I mean," said the first speaker, with a slight touch of indignation in his tone, "*does he believe in the divinity of Christ?*" It turned out apparently that the admirable layman had expressly said that he did not, but that he believed Jesus Christ to have been the most perfect man who had ever lived. So it was agreed that he could not be a Christian. And this is not an uncommon attitude of mind among the best of our laity.'

So begins an article on 'The Divinity of Christ—What does it Mean?' The article lies hidden in the heart of a book with the title of *Faith or Fear?* (Macmillan; 3s. 6d.), if anything can be said to be hidden in a book which maintains a fresh attitude to Christian doctrine throughout, and is so timely. It is a book to which certain members of the Church of England have contributed articles. They are not in all cases known to one another, or even to the editor. But every one of them has been driven by the war to think out a new way of commending Christ. For with all their catholicity they are assured that the Church is failing. And she is failing simply because she is no longer bearing witness to the living Christ, the Redeemer and Saviour of men. The editor of the book is the Rev. C. H. S. MATTHEWS, Vicar of St. Peter's in Thanet. The author of the article on 'The Divinity of Christ' is the Rev. Harold ANSON, Rector of Birch-in-Rusholme, Manchester.

It is the editor who says that the Church is

ailing, and why. But Mr. ANSON agrees. And not only does he agree that the Church is no longer bearing witness to the living Christ, he even holds that she no longer understands who the living Christ is.

He observes a growing tendency to separate the Godhead from the Manhood in Christ. First there are those who take the Manhood and leave the Godhead alone. 'They feel that, if they admit that He is God, they deprive Him of reality and make Him inhuman. It appears to them that the parsons want to rob them of the real, genuine, brotherly, flesh and blood man, whom they can understand, and who understands them, and to substitute for Him a sort of demigod, who is neither exactly God nor wholly man, whose psychology is quite incomprehensible, who acts, now as God, now as man, who cannot really be any example to us, because He can always summon to His aid resources which lie outside our scope, and who bears no sort of real relation to mankind as we know it to-day. For such a being they have no use.'

Then there are those who are very zealous for the Godhead. They are mostly, Mr. ANSON thinks, those who have some official position in the Church, whether in the pulpit or in the Sunday School. Their theology is the theology of the stained-glass window. Their idea is that 'by some necessary and inevitable process (usually connected with the Miraculous Birth) the son of Mary was, magically as it were, and in a moment, lifted out of all those limitations which we associate with humanity, except in so far as He chose to assume voluntarily certain humiliating experiences, just as the wealthy West-ender bent on "slumming" assumes a temporary and dramatic poverty in unclean surroundings prior to returning to a life of comfort and ease.'

Now Mr. ANSON does not believe that the truth about the person of Christ can be gained by simply combining this Man and this God into a single

composite Being, to be called the God-Man. It is doubtful if such a composite Being is thinkable. It is certain that He is not the Christian Christ. Far more near to the Christian conception of Christ, if we could reach it, would be the thought of one who could not be the perfect man without being also God, and who could not be the perfect God without being also man. For the terms God and man are not antithetical, but complementary.

Mr. ANSON tells us that to many laymen the Christ whom the clergy preach is one who condescended to patronize men. He simulated, or even genuinely experienced, an interest and share in the ordinary trials of life. But it was 'nothing more than the amiable adventures of the slumming ladies who make excursions among a class to which they do not belong, and whose point of view must always be wholly alien and unreal to the class which they set out to reform. Their feeling about such a Christ as the Church appears to propound is exactly that of the Labour Party towards the proposals of their middle-class sympathizers: it is very kind of them to be interested, but they prefer to work out their own problems with the help of leaders who belong to their own class.'

But the true Christ is just a leader who belongs to our own class. The true Christ is a true man. There is that in man which comes to its fulfilment only when it is one with God; and there is that in God—we call it Sonship—which comes to its fulfilment only when it is one with man. To make this oneness possible for all men, He came: 'that they may all be one; even as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be in us.' The Incarnation united God with man: the Redemption united man with God. And so close is the affinity between God and man that the Son of God who first formed the union could have had no divided consciousness. His acts are not to be parcelled out between His Godhead and His manhood. He did not walk on the water as a God and rest on the well as a man. Just as we now

find no difficulty, but a great relief, in knowing that God is capable of suffering, so we may find a great deliverance in knowing that to humanity nothing is impossible.

Now, as soon as we see that Godhead and manhood are complementary, we see how we may reach a simple thinkable conception of the Person of Christ. Is He man? Then what is man? Man at his best and highest is the Lord Jesus Christ. Is He God? Then what is God? God is simply the highest and best that we can conceive of man, and that again is the Lord Jesus Christ. To separate the God from the Man in Christ, and say this He did as God and that as Man, is to do violence, not only to Christ, but to our own thinking. For we cannot think of Christ (if we think of Him truly) without thinking of God; and we cannot think of God (if we think of Him truly) without thinking of Christ.

We do think of God without thinking of Christ. We think of Him as in deliberate opposition to Christ. We think of Him still, if not so crudely as before, as One who exacts penalties which are remitted only at Christ's intercession. We do think also of Christ without thinking of God. This is the peculiar error of the thought of our day. For we are much given to thinking of Christ as just one of ourselves, even demanding that He be preached as just one of ourselves. And the immediate consequence is the discovery, as we suppose, that He was not quite perfect, and therefore not altogether such as God is, though it is from Him that we have our knowledge of God.

What is the greatest thing in the world? 'Love,' said Professor Henry DRUMMOND, and used winning words in saying it. 'Righteousness,' says Principal P. T. FORSYTH, and says it in language that is stern and uncompromising.

Dr. FORSYTH has written a book about the war. He calls it *The Christian Ethic of War* (Longmans; 6s. net). Why has he written it? Not because he

is a writer of books, but because he feels that the teaching of Christ, and every form of sound Christian doctrine, demand of us that we should go to war. He feels this so strongly that—we must not say he cannot find language strong enough to express his feelings. Dr. FORSYTH always finds language that is strong enough, however strong his feelings are. He feels it so strongly that he uses language of those who think they should not go to war which no military representative on any tribunal need ever hope to surpass.

Why, he asks, do Christian men hesitate to go to war? Their answer is, Because Christ taught them to forgive their enemies, not to go to war with them. Did He? Then why did He not forgive His own enemies? Dr. FORSYTH is not forgetting the prayer on the Cross: 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.' It is a beautiful prayer. Dr. FORSYTH is not oblivious of the beauty of it. But it was not answered. Wait till the seventieth year from the birth of Christ and you will see if it was answered. Three times Dr. FORSYTH refers to that year 70 A.D. and the destruction of Jerusalem. And every time he says it was God's judgment on the Jews for the Cross of Christ.

But again the pacifist answers, and says that Christ taught us to love our enemies and not to go to war with them. To which Dr. FORSYTH replies with emphasis that He taught the love of enemies to His own followers as followers, not to rulers and magistrates. 'Love,' he says, 'has its place rather within the Church than between societies like nation and nation.'

What rules between societies like nation and nation is not love, but righteousness. Is that a little startling? Once at least Dr. FORSYTH has a suspicion that it may seem so. Therefore he puts it in this way: 'It is not at last a question of *love* between men over against *righteousness* between men, but of the love and righteousness between holy God and evil man, between love as com-

munion where it meets love and love as saving judgment where it does not. It is the difference between a mystic communion of love and a righteous kingdom of love. It is a question of the application and exercise of God's love; which exercise is one thing without a Church of the regenerate, and another thing as righteous discipline and judgment-grace towards a yet unregenerate world. The salvation of God is, to those who are but in a relation of law, righteousness; but to those who are joined in Gospel it is love. In the one it is law, judgment, war; to the others joy and peace in the Holy Ghost. But always love and always holy at any cost to life or limb.'

But Dr. FORSYTH will startle us yet more. He challenges our interpretation of the Sermon on the Mount. He challenges any interpretation that comes to the Sermon on the Mount before it has come to the Cross. The Sermon on the Mount says, 'Resist not evil'; but what does the Cross say? We did think that the Cross said the same, if it said anything at all. Dr. FORSYTH will not allow us to think so any more. For again we notice that the Cross is not to be understood till we include the destruction of Jerusalem. Did Jesus at the Cross reject the help of the Father's legions of angels? When the time came for the judgment of God on Jerusalem, 'He summoned the legions it did not suit Him to ask for to avert the Cross.'

The religion of the Sermon on the Mount (as usually understood) and the religion of the Cross, he says, are two different religions. The one is represented by the 23rd Psalm, the other by the 51st. The one type Dr. FORSYTH calls anthropocentric religion. For the prime interest of the 23rd Psalm is man, with God to help him. It ends in subjective humanism, with God squeezed out. The other type is theocentric. The prime interest of the 51st Psalm is God, with man to worship and serve Him absolutely. Its mysticism is objective and moral, and it ends in the Kingdom of God.

Jesus as Prisoner.

BY THE REV. JAMES MOFFATT, D.D., D.LITT., HON. M.A. (OXON), PROFESSOR OF
CHURCH HISTORY IN THE UNITED FREE CHURCH COLLEGE, GLASGOW.

DURING the eight years which have passed since I published the article on 'The Trial of Jesus' in THE DICTIONARY OF CHRIST AND THE GOSPELS (vol. ii. pp. 749-759), very little material has accumulated except on the fringes of the subject. The chronology has been discussed, particularly in the light of astronomical calculations; sporadic contributions have been made to the criticism of various episodes, notably Dr. Karl Kastner's *Jesus vor Pilatus* (1912), Dr. A. W. Verrall's study of the Lucan account of Jesus before Herod (*Journal of Theological Studies*, x. 322-353), and Miss Brodrick's *Trial and Crucifixion of Jesus Christ of Nazareth* (1908); but hardly any radical change has taken place in the critical position. Perhaps more work has been done on the topographical details than on the historical; which is not surprising, for the critical estimate of these narratives involves not only a comparative study of the Synoptic and Johannine traditions, but a reconstruction of the situation in the light of archæological and antiquarian research. These two lines of inquiry, into the literary data and into the contemporary Jewish situation, react upon one another. The data or probabilities thrown up by the latter, especially, must affect any estimate formed of the latter; they must be allowed to check, if not to determine, the interpretation of the relevant texts at several crucial points.

One illustration of this interconnexion is furnished by the allusions to Jesus as 'bound.' The Synoptic tradition¹ records that He was not bound until the morning after the arrest in Gethsemane, and not until He had been tried by the council; Jesus was bound by the Jews,² before being dispatched to Pilate, the binding perhaps denoting that He had been condemned to death. The

Johannine tradition makes the binding take place apparently as a precaution in Gethsemane;³ Jesus is bound before He is sent to Annas, and bound again (or, still) when He is dispatched to Caiaphas. It would not decide the question finally, if we knew the exact custom followed by the Jews in dealing with a prisoner under arrest, for we cannot assume that the forms of legal procedure would be scrupulously observed under the circumstances. But there is uncertainty even as to these very forms. Was a prisoner kept bound during his examination? Or, was he unbound when he was being tried? The Roman custom seems to have been the former even in Palestine and Syria, if we are to judge from the experience of Paul (Ac 26²⁰). But, according to the Johannine⁴ as well as to the Synoptic tradition, Jesus was in the hands of the Jews till He was handed over to Pilate. The Fourth Gospel rightly preserves the fact of a two-fold examination of Jesus, before Annas and before Caiaphas, in different places. The latter was the trial proper, if we can speak of any Jewish trial at all. Annas, we are told, sent Jesus δεδεμένον πρὸς Καϊάφαν τὸν ἀρχιερέα (18²⁴), and the exegesis of δεδεμένον partly depends on the view we take of the preliminary proceedings before Annas. If these corresponded to a trial or judicial examination of the prisoner, then it is on the whole more likely that δεδεμένον means 'bound again' than 'still bound' or 'bound as he was,'⁵ on the assumption that Jews were in the habit of freeing a prisoner when he was being cross-examined by the authorities.⁶

This is not a point, of course, at which we can expect any light from the Synoptic tradition. But

³ Where the arrest is made by men who include a Roman (18¹²) military detachment. The latter would act as they did in the case of Paul (Ac 21³³).

⁴ Whether the Roman soldiers left Jesus, after consigning Him to Annas, we are not told; but the responsibility for Him throughout the night rested with His Jewish captors.

⁵ As in Ac 24²⁷, ὁ Φῆλιξ κατέλιπε τὸν Παῦλον δεδεμένον.

⁶ It is possible that Ac 22³⁰ favours the idea that a prisoner was unbound before a Jewish tribunal, for the Roman commander unbinds Paul before taking him into the presence of the Jewish authorities. But the passage is not free from difficulties.

¹ Though Luke omits all references to binding (23¹).

² *i.e.* the mob. There is no absolute proof in any of the Gospels (not even in Lk 22⁵²) that Annas was on the spot; the presence of one of his attendants proves nothing. The mob were armed with swords, and with clubs, *i.e.* with the long oak quarterstaff or fighting-bat, 'an old Semitic weapon; handstaves are mentioned in the Book of Samuel and Ezekiel. The bedels and rake-hell band of the chief priests came armed to the garden, to take Jesus, with swords and staves' (Doughty, *Arabia Deserta*, i. 147).

in Mt 26⁵⁷ (οἱ δὲ κρατήσαντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπήγαγον πρὸς Καϊάφαν) the phrase πρὸς Καϊάφαν, as in Jn 18²⁴, raises a topographical question. Where did Caiaphas hold his sitting? The exact locality is doubtful. If πρὸς Καϊάφαν meant simply that Jesus was sent to Caiaphas, *i.e.* to where Caiaphas as high priest was known to have convened the council, it need not have been his house, but the ordinary or a special meeting-place of that body. There is a rabbinic tradition that forty years before the fall of Jerusalem the council met outside the temple precincts, and Derenbourg¹ based on this the conjecture that the council before which Jesus was condemned met in the *chanujoth*, the booths or bazaars held by the powerful family of Annas on the Mount of Olives. But the tradition is not to be accepted unhesitatingly, and Derenbourg's guess has found little favour among those best competent to judge. It is probable that the council was allowed to hold its sederunt outside the temple precincts, under certain exceptional circumstances. The Synoptic tradition may well be correct in making the members gather in the

palace of the high priest Caiaphas, which was not far from the fortress of Antonia, or (more probably) the palace of Herod, where Pilate held his trial. At any rate, these problems of topography are not affected by the phrase πρὸς Καϊάφαν. On the other hand, the meaning of δεδεμένον in Jn 18²⁴ is partly determined, as I have said, by our conception of what the proceedings under Annas amounted to.

Both points are raised afresh, however, in the interesting hypothesis which Sir William Ramsay has recently put forward in the pages of this magazine (xxvii. 296 f., 360 f., 410 f., 471 f., 540 f.), on 'The Denials of Peter.' They are exactly the sort of points at which an archæologist is sometimes able to correct conventional interpretations of a literary text. As the aim of the hypothesis is to settle the differences between the Synoptic and Johannine traditions and to disentangle the historical sequence, it will be well to have before us a brief table of the relevant episodes in the Synoptic narrative of what occurred between the arrest in Gethsemane and the consignment of Jesus to Pilate on the following morning.

MARK.		MATTHEW.		LUKE.	
(A) 14 ⁵³	night: πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιερέα.	26 ⁵⁷	night: πρὸς Καϊάφαν τ. ἀ.	22 ⁵⁴	night: εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἀ.
14 ⁵³⁻⁶⁴	cross - questioning and condemnation by authorities.	26 ⁵⁹⁻⁶⁶	cross - questioning and condemnation by authorities.		
14 ⁶⁵	maltreatment of Jesus.	26 ⁶⁷⁻⁶⁸	maltreatment of Jesus.	22 ⁵⁴⁻⁶²	Peter's denial.
14 ⁶⁶⁻⁷²	Peter's denial.	26 ⁶⁹⁻⁷⁵	Peter's denial.	*22 ⁶³⁻⁶⁵	maltreatment of Jesus.
(B) 15 ¹	morning: meeting of council. Jesus bound and sent to Pilate.	27 ¹	morning: meeting of council. Jesus bound and sent to Pilate.	22 ⁶⁶⁻⁷¹	morning: meeting of council, cross - questioning and condemnation by authorities.
				23 ¹	Jesus sent to Pilate.

Now the Johannine tradition records a double night² examination, first by Annas and then by

¹ 'Ces échoppes étaient assez connues à Jérusalem pour qu'on les désignât simplement sous le nom de *chanouiot*, et c'est là que siégeait le sanhédrin lorsqu'il eut quitté le sanctuaire. Là, Jésus fut conduit dans la demeure de Caïphe et de son beau-père Hanan, sur le mont des Oliviers même' (*Essai sur l'Histoire et la Géographie de la Palestine*, pp. 467-468).

² The rabbinic statement of Jose ben Chalafat, which Sir William Ramsay cannot verify (p. 361), seems to be from *Babyl. Sanhed.* 88 b.

Caiaphas: the latter is only mentioned, but under the former (when the canonical order of chap. 18 is retained) some episodes are grouped which correspond more or less roughly to a cross-questioning of Jesus, a certain maltreatment, and Peter's denial.

Instead of placing the informal investigation by Annas before (A), and identifying (A) with the trial under Caiaphas, Sir William Ramsay harmonizes the two traditions by conjecturing that

(A) really was the informal trial under Annas, and that (B) corresponds to the trial under Caiaphas. This hangs from the hypothesis that the writer of the Fourth Gospel was John, who, as an eye-witness, must have had a better knowledge of the course of events than was available to the other Evangelists. I do not enter again into this problem. My point is to show that whatever the merits of the theory may be, it involves a forced interpretation of one or two phrases in the text.

For example, if this theory is to advance, it is essential to account for the remark in Mt 26⁵⁷ that Jesus was taken by His captors to Caiaphas the high priest, where the scribes and elders had gathered. Sir William ingeniously surmounts the obstacle by explaining that *πρὸς Καϊάφαν* means the ultimate destination of the party, that the only sense of the Greek is judicial ('to appear before Caiaphas as judge'), but that, as it was not yet time for Caiaphas to preside over the council, Jesus was taken to the house of Annas. Thus there is perfect agreement between Matthew and John, for the latter states that Jesus was taken *πρὸς Ἀνναν πρῶτον* (18¹³), and that Annas sent him on later to Caiaphas (*πρὸς Καϊάφαν*, 18²⁴). Furthermore, *πρὸς Καϊάφαν* must have the same sense in Jn 18²⁴ as in Mt 26⁵⁷, and this leads to the assertion that Jesus never was in the house of Caiaphas at all; the morning trial before Caiaphas took place in the ordinary meeting-place of the council; and *πρὸς Καϊάφαν* never denotes 'to (the residence of) Caiaphas,' as scholars have hitherto assumed.

In the course of his argument he challenges my translation of Mt 26⁵⁷ and Jn 18²⁴, and even charges me with misunderstanding the Greek in such a way as to distort the evidence of the Gospel text. This is a matter of exegesis, fortunately, not of archæology. Greek is Greek. You do not need to have travelled or dug in the East in order to know the scope of a preposition or of a participle, and I propose, with the Editor's permission, to show that Sir William Ramsay's charges are not well founded.

(1) The first passage is Mt 26⁵⁷: *οἱ δὲ κρατήσαντες τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπήγαγον πρὸς Καϊάφαν τὸν ἀρχιερέα, ὅπου οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ πρεσβύτεροι συνήχθησαν*. The Authorized Version translates *πρὸς Καϊάφαν* by 'to Caiaphas'; the Revisers, noting the *ὅπου* which follows, improved this into 'to the house of Caiaphas,' and I took the same line in my translation. It is quite a common use of *πρὸς*. In N.T.

Greek itself we have two or three decisive parallels, as, for example, in Ac 11³, where the circumcision party at Jerusalem charge Peter with lax conduct: *εἰσῆλθες πρὸς ἄνδρας ἀκροβυστίαν ἔχοντας καὶ συνέφαγες αὐτοῖς*. Their objection was that he had entered the house of Cornelius and his friends and partaken of food, not that he had joined an open-air picnic. To enter the society of the uncircumcised meant, in this connexion, to enter their house. It is perfectly fair, then, to bring this out in an English rendering by, 'You went into the houses of the uncircumcised and you ate with them.' A still more clear instance of *πρὸς* with the accusative of a personal name implying the house of the person mentioned occurs in Ac 16⁴⁰: *ἐξελθόντες δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς φυλακῆς εἰσῆλθον πρὸς τὴν Λυδίαν καὶ ἰδόντες παρέκλεσαν τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καὶ ἐξῆλθον*, where *πρὸς τὴν Λυδίαν* is another way of saying that when Paul and Silas left the prison they went 'to the house of Lydia' (cp. v. 12). These are Lucan¹ instances, but scholars have noted similar cases of this use of *πρὸς* without the article in the Fourth Gospel, e.g. a passage like this very 18²⁴, where Zahn points out that *πρὸς Καϊάφαν* 'kann heissen in die Wohnung des Genannten, und die Verbindung des Namens mit dem Amtstitel an dieser Stelle lässt vermuten dass die Wohnung gemeint ist,' or like 20² (*ἔρχεται πρὸς Σίμωνα Πέτρον καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἄλλον μαθητὴν*), where Dr. E. A. Abbott² suggests that the repetition of the preposition means, simply that 'the two were not living in the same house, and Mary is to be supposed as being accompanied by Peter to the house of the other disciple.' I do not lay much stress on Jn 20², but the general fact is clear, and in order to clinch the matter, I shall quote the first case³ which occurs to me in the LXX. In Gn 44¹⁴, 'Judah and his brothers came to [יהודה וְאֶבְרָהָם] Joseph's house, for he was yet there.' The Greek translator rendered this, *εἰσῆλθεν δὲ Ἰουδας καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτοῦ πρὸς Ἰωσηφ, ἔτι αὐτοῦ ὄντος ἐκεῖ*. Here again the article is absent, as in Mt 26⁵⁷. But it is needless

¹ Luke's equivalent for Matthew's *πρὸς Καϊάφαν τὸν ἀρχιερέα* and Mark's *πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιερέα* is *εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως*, and this shows how he understood the preposition and the situation, for he had Mark's text at least before him. As Sir G. A. Smith observes (*Jerusalem*, ii. 571), 'locality is implied also in Mt 26⁵⁷, Mk 14^{65f.}'

² *Johannine Grammar*, 236^f.

³ I notice now one even earlier, where 'the woman was taken into Pharaoh's house' (12¹⁵, *נִינְיָא בֵּיתָא*) is rendered *πρὸς Φαραώ*, the inferior variants being *πρὸς (εἰς) τὸν οἶκον Φ*.

to multiply instances of a usage which is familiar to any student of Hellenistic Greek, namely, that *πρός* with the accusative of a personal name may mean 'to the house of that person,' like *chez* in French. The LXX is full of instances, e.g. Ex 2¹⁰ 10¹, 1 S 16²¹ 19⁷, 2 S 1², Est 2¹⁰ etc. Whether it is correct to expand the proposition thus, depends altogether on the context, but the rendering is perfectly legitimate.

In view of this, it is amazing to find that Sir William Ramsay dismisses the R.V. of Mt 26⁵⁷ as 'impossible, for in Greek the preposition *πρός* with the accusative of a personal name cannot mean "to the house of that person"; but it is technical and idiomatic in the sense of "to appear before a person as judge in a court of justice," and this is what is meant in this place. Dr. Moffatt in his "New Translation" follows the error of the Revisers, although the Authorised Version is right.' This is a strong statement, but it is strong only in language. The negative assertion about *πρός* is positively erroneous. It must be a recent discovery, for in *St. Paul the Traveller* (first edition, p. 223) Ac 16⁴⁰ is rendered by Sir William himself, 'and they went out from the prison and entered into¹ Lydia's house'! The fact is, however, that it is not a discovery at all, but a slip, and a bad slip. Whether the judicial and technical sense of *πρός* is applicable to the present passage is another question. So far as grammar goes, it is as possible as the local sense with a verb of motion, but I do not think it probable that the writer of Mt intended to make a subtle suggestion in 26⁵⁷, that Jesus was simply being led away to appear before Caiaphas as judge, since he has just used *πρός* in its local sense (v.¹⁸, where both the Authorized and the Revised Versions render *πρός* σέ by 'at thy house'). Even in the parallel Johannine text, there is a detail which militates against the hypothesis that *πρός Καϊάφαν* in 18²⁴ implies 'before Caiaphas as judge,'—I mean the fact that the Evangelist has just (v.¹³) written, ἤγαγον *πρός Ἀνναν* *πρώτον*. Now Sir William Ramsay allows that while *πρός Ἀνναν* here is 'to (be judged by) Annas,' the judicial sense² does not exclude the local, and the examination before Annas is admitted not only to have taken place in the house of Annas, but to have been merely an informal, unofficial inquiry, pre-

liminary to the real trial before Caiaphas. It is surely natural that, in the absence of any specific indication to the contrary, *πρός Καϊάφαν* should have the same meaning as *πρός Ἀνναν*, especially when *πρώτον* seems to link both statements together; and it is illogical to allow the local implication of *πρός* in *πρός Ἀνναν*, and then to fall foul of those who take *πρός Καϊάφαν* in the same way.

In this connexion I must say a word about the Lucan tradition. It has been long disputed whether Luke intended Annas or Caiaphas when he wrote *εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ ἀρχιερέως*. If he meant Annas,³—and there is a good case for this,—then his enigmatic statement about the morning council (22⁶⁶, *συνήχθη τὸ πρεσβυτέριον τοῦ λαοῦ ἀρχιερεῖς τε καὶ γραμματεῖς, καὶ ἀπήγαγον αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ συνέδριον αὐτῶν*) certainly leaves it an open question where the council meeting was held. If *εἰς τὸ συνέδριον αὐτῶν* denotes the place, it is clear that this was not the house of Annas. But there is nothing to prove that it was the regular meeting-place of the council; it may have been the house of Caiaphas, for all that we know. And *συνέδριον* may mean 'council' as well as 'council-chamber'; it was used in the same broad sense as our 'court,' and *εἰς τὸ συνέδριον* might well mean 'before the court.'⁴ So far as the Lucan⁴ evidence goes, it does not necessarily prove or disprove that the council met in the house of Caiaphas.

(2) The second passage which has been brought under discussion is Jn 18²⁴: *ἀπέστειλεν οὖν αὐτὸν δ' Ἀννας δεδεμένον πρὸς Καϊάφαν τὸν ἀρχιερέα*. As Jesus had been bound already, according to the Fourth Gospel (18¹²), by the time that He reached the palace of Annas, the repetition of 'bound' here is curious. If it occurred in v.²⁸, it would be more intelligible, for this would bring the Johannine tradition into line with the Synoptic. But the unexpected mention of *δεδεμένον* in the twenty-fourth verse makes one ask why the writer went out of his way to describe Jesus as 'bound,' when He was dispatched by Annas to Caiaphas. Was it because his readers would assume that the prisoner

³ Wellhausen, who inclines to this view, finds that the original framework of Jn 18 agreed with Lk, but he restores the original by drastically expunging not only v.²⁴ but *πρώτον* and *ἀρχιερεὺς ὡν τοῦ ἐναντιοῦ ἐκείνου* from v.¹³ and *ἀπὸ τοῦ Καϊάφα* from v.²⁸ (*Evangelium des Johannes*, p. 81).

⁴ But *ἀπὸ τοῦ Καϊάφα* in Jn 18²⁸ means 'from the house of Caiaphas,' as Dr. Field (*Notes on Translation of N.T.*, p. 106), recognized, quoting the parallel expression in Mk 5³⁵ (*ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου*).

¹ I assume this translates *πρός*, not the inferior reading *εἰς*.

² Which is probably present in Lk 23⁷ and Ac 25²¹, in both cases with *ἀναπέμειν*.

had been unbound during the interview with Annas? This view of the case is not a novelty of exegesis. It has been held by several orthodox and conservative editors of the Gospel, notably by Godet and Westcott.¹ The former thinks that 'Jesus had no doubt been unbound during His examination; this scene over, Annas had Him bound anew to send Him to Caiaphas.' Westcott reads the passage in the same way: 'During the inquiry the Lord would naturally be set free. This explains the notice that He was (again) bound before going on to Caiaphas.' The inference is scarcely natural; we want more evidence for the assumption than seems to be as yet available. Still, it is a fair conjecture, and as I read the narrative in this light, I translate the verse, 'Then Annas had Him bound and sent Him to Caiaphas.' Which is true to the Greek, and not untrue to the spirit and meaning of the story; it simply puts into definite English a view for which there is at least a reasonable amount of probability, as several distinguished predecessors have recognized. This second binding of Jesus was carried out by order of Annas; δεδεμένον by itself means no more than 'in fetters' (δέσμιον), but, when the text is read as I have suggested, there is nothing in Greek grammar to prevent the full meaning of the term being brought out as I have done, since the perfect participle can refer to some previous action by the subject of the active verb in the sentence. I need only cite instances like Ac 9² (ὅπως ἐάν τις εὗρη τῆς ὁδοῦ ὄντας, ἄνδρας τε καὶ γυναῖκας, δεδεμένους ἀγάγη εἰς Ἱερουσαλὴμ), where δεδεμένους denotes a binding carried out under Paul's orders before the prisoners were dispatched to Jerusalem; his letters of authority empowered him 'to put any man or woman in chains . . . and bring them to Jerusalem.' The same construction recurs in Ac 9²¹, in the inferior textual variant (of A, etc.) on Mk 12³ (ἀπέστειλαν ἡτιμωμένον), and in a passage which I chanced to read this morning in Lucian's *Vera Historia*, i. 41 (ἀντὶ δὲ χειρῶν σιδηρῶν πολύποδας μεγάλους ἐκδεδεμένους ἀλλήλοις ἐπερρίπτουν), where the meaning is that they first tied the polypods together and then threw them as grappling-irons.² In Jn 18²⁴, instead of writing something like ὁ οὖν

¹ Lagrange (*Évangile selon Saint Marc*, pp 383-384) takes the same view: Jesus was 'probablement délié pendant l'interrogatoire.' Meyer had anticipated this.

² In 3 Mac 3²⁵ we read similarly, τοὺς ἐννεμομένους . . . ἀποστείλαι πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἐν δεσμοῖς σιδηροῖς πάντοθεν κατακεκλεισμένους.

Ἄννας ἔδωκεν αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπέστειλεν . . . , the author prefers to use the passive participle δεδεμένον, and no law of Greek grammar can be alleged why he should not, if he wanted his readers to understand that Annas had Jesus rebound before dispatching Him to Caiaphas. Whether that is what he meant them to understand is another story. But the Greek at any rate is patient of this interpretation. To understand 'again' with δεδεμένον is not any more difficult than to understand 'still.'

Sir William Ramsay is not pleased with this, however. He declares that such a translation as I have given 'is not possible within the limits of Greek grammar,' and translates the verse, 'Annas therefore sent Jesus bound as He was, to Caiaphas,' adding in a footnote, 'ὁ δεδεμένος, the prisoner.' But the Fourth Evangelist did not write τὸν δεδεμένον, and 'the limits of Greek grammar' are broader than the measure of this hasty statement. I am quite prepared to admit that the Greek can mean, 'bound as he was,' although this would be more natural³ if v.²⁴ followed vv.¹²⁻¹³ immediately, as in the Sinaitic Syriac version. But Sir William Ramsay brusquely sets aside all ancient and modern transpositions of the text, and prefers to work with the canonical order or disorder of the verses. He thinks that Jesus was never unbound in the house of Annas, which he is perfectly entitled to do, although in a speculative moment the harmonizing instinct leads him to suggest that Jesus might have been released from His bonds when under trial before the Jews, in conformity with 'the higher moral standard on which the Jewish nation stood in comparison with the pagan races around.' But what he is not entitled to do is to add that 'into the clear and important statement' of Jn 18²⁴ 'Dr. Moffatt has introduced a mistranslation which distorts the evidence . . . here he goes wrong, without (so far as I know) any predecessor.' The Johannine sentence is important, but it is not clear; it is not unambiguous except to those who shut their eyes deliberately to the possibilities of the Greek and to the uncertainty of our information about the local conditions. I do not assert dogmatically that it is right to render δεδεμένον as I have done, and wrong to render it 'bound as he was.' The point which I wish to make is simply

³ As Loisy points out (*Le Quatrième Évangile*, pp. 828-833), the twenty-fourth verse, when δεδεμένον is taken to mean 'bound as he was,' 'laisse entendre que Hanan renvoie Jésus tel qu'on le lui a amené, sans intermède ni délai.'

that the former translation is legitimate, so far as the Greek goes, and that ultimately it depends on more than grammatical considerations whether δεδεμένον should be rendered by 'bound as he was' or 'bound anew.' It is quite probable that earlier translators, who took the latter view, were content to render the text literally and translate δεδεμένον

by 'bound.' The periphrasis which I have printed may be original, but if it is true to the Greek, it is none the worse for that, and I hope to have indicated in this article that it expresses not inadequately an interpretation of the narrative which has been current for many years among editors of the text.

Literature.

THE ARCHÆOLOGY OF THE HOLY LAND.

IF 'the first fine careless rapture' of Palestinian exploration can never be recaptured, there never was a time when the subject had a deeper interest for the serious student of the Bible. It is not only that now we know a great many facts which throw light upon obscure passages; it is that the whole atmosphere surrounding the Book of books has been altered for us. We stand closer to Isaiah and Jeremiah than our fathers did; we sympathize better with their experiences; we receive more intelligently, perhaps also more reverently, the message which they deliver. This is a great gain, a gain which we shall appreciate more and more as time passes.

One of the most diligent and accomplished students of *The Archæology of the Holy Land* is Mr. P. S. P. Handcock, formerly Assistant in the Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities in the British Museum. Under that title he has published a book (Fisher Unwin; 10s. 6d. net) which will be found to be a convenient handbook to its subject and quite authoritative. Its facts may nearly all be traced in such great books on Palestine as Dr. R. A. S. Macalister's *Gezer*; but here they are presented in short compass and clear arrangement. The following summary of conclusions regarding the religion of the Pre-Canaanites is a good example of Mr. Handcock's skill and knowledge:

'Of the religious customs of the Pre-Canaanite inhabitants of Palestine we know very little, while of their beliefs we know practically nothing. Their temples or sanctuaries were caves, and here they offered sacrifices to their gods. Libations were sometimes poured into cup-shaped hollows excavated in the rock surface above the caves,

from which they were conveyed by channels into the cave sanctuaries below. Meat-offerings as well as drink-offerings were made, and, as already observed, one of the animals that was used as a sacrificial victim appears to have been the pig.'

The book is handsomely produced. The illustrations are numerous, and they are not merely ornamental, they elucidate the text.

PEPYS.

Old Samuel Pepys can scarcely be ranked among the moralists, but Saml. Pepys, Junr., is undoubtedly a great moral reformer. He has written *A Diary of the Great Warr* (John Lane; 5s. net), which is entertaining and more. The pharisaic and sensual self-satisfaction of his renowned original is only emphasized a little, and then made the mirror in which thousands of men may see their own unlovely likenesses. And, as they see, they must surely repent. Let them see to it that they repent before the war is over. There is still time to give and do something for the winning of the war, perhaps even be something for which the war will be worth winning. That is how Pepys Junr. may be found a great moral reformer.

The style of old Pepys is delightfully preserved.

'Dec. 31, 1914.—Evening mine accompts this night, for the year, I find my gettings are 399*l* 15*s*. less than my last year's, through dividends lost since the warr, whereto be added about 30*l* allowed proportion of enlarged income tax; which is to say, that I am poorer in gettings by 429*l* 15*s*. than I was a year ago. Yet, on the other hand, by my prudent provisions and self-denials, I have abated spendings by above 300*l*; *Items*, saved in discounts of offerings on Lord's Day, 4 pounds 10 shillings; on givings in charity, 15 guineas; on my wife's cloathes, 20 pounds (about); ditto on mine own,

1 pound 18 shillings and sixpence; on dinners and other entertainments to my friends (none), 35 pounds; on wedding, Christmas, and other gifts (none), 19 pounds; on vails (25 *per centum* reduced), 7 pounds (neare); on subsidies to poor relations (all withheld), 150 pounds; on going to the play only when I have had tickets given me, 17 guineas; on my wife's perquisites out of house-keeping moneys (disallowed as from August 5), 23 pounds; on her subscription to Mudie's, 1 guinea; on sundry small charges not particularly specifiable, 10 pounds. Whereby I am, since the warr, less than 120 pounds out, and here-against is to be set my balance of gettings above spendings from January to August, near 500 pounds. So, with all our stresses, I to end the year 380 pounds better than I began it, and to bed in pretty good heart.'

'Mar. 28 (*Palm Sunday*).—To Paul's and there did hear one of the canons (Simpson) play the fool about loving the Germans and using them tenderly; which, with them in their present mind, is as good as exhorting us to a gentle complaisance towards the Devil. All sober men do wonder what is come to the doctors of our church, first Lyttelton of Eton, and now Simpson, that they be so given over to peace-making, and 'tis thought this shall incline many church-men to turn Methody or Anabaptist. One who drank tea with us this afternoon tells of a certain bishop that did preach of late on the warr, and quotes Solomon's text, "Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." And a report of the sermon being sent by some news-sheet to the censor for his approval, comes back with the note: "The War Office have no objection to the publication of this statement, but they have no information on the subject."'

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF A RUSSIAN.

There are only two ways of understanding the psychology of a Russian, the one to be born in Russia, the other, and less satisfactory, to know thoroughly the Russian language. So says Madame N. Jarintzov. And for the benefit of those who have not had the good fortune to be born in Russia she has written a book on *The Russians and their Language* (Blackwell; 6s. net).

Madame Jarintzov assures us that the Russian language is not so difficult as it is believed to be.

She gives the elementary things of it in an Introduction. In the rest of the book she shows how intimately the language and the character of the Russians are associated. And she succeeds (to our very great enjoyment, for she has a fine mastery of her pen) in showing that a nation's character is reflected in the words which it uses. And as she does so she shows also how impossible it is to turn the Russian language into English, because there are some English words for which there is no Russian equivalent, and many Russian words for which there is no equivalent in English.

The Russians have no word to stand for 'respectability.' They have not the idea; it is not suitable to their psychology. They have adopted the English word: but not exactly in its English meaning.

On the other hand, there is no English equivalent for the Russian *chûtkost*. It is 'tact,' but with more soul in it. It is 'consideration,' but with a touch of humour. 'The other day a Russian friend of mine, descending from a taxi in London, looked at the taximeter, and saw that it showed one-and-tenpence. Nevertheless, he politely asked the driver how much the fare was. The man looked at the apparatus and said, "Half-a-crown." The Russian pretended that he never noticed the swindling, gave the man two-and-eightpence, and silently went his way. He did so instinctively, not wanting to make the man feel uncomfortable.'

Still Madame Jarintzov thinks it is possible to translate some words better than we do. She thinks 'it is high time to explain that the famous "Little father" does not mean "little" father at all! The old Russian word for father, *bâtushka*, does not suggest an atom of the tone in which "little father," or the German *Väterchen*, is pronounced. This way of translating it is sickly-sentimental! No, *bâtushka* is used either in a grave, deferential way—and that is how it came first to be applied in the olden days to the Princes and later to the Tsars, and is still the habitual form of addressing the priests; or else it is used in a very argumentative tone, essentially Russian, called up in quick discussion, which one never hears in English society, and therefore is hardly explicable: it carries some familiarity, some respect, some rebuke, some humour, some surprise—very often all of them at the same time!'

FOLK PSYCHOLOGY.

The expression 'Folk Psychology' is German (*Völkerpsychologie*); it has scarcely entered the English language yet. In happier times the translation into English of Professor W. Wundt's *Elements of Folk Psychology* (Allen & Unwin; 15s. net) would have secured its acceptance. In spite, however, of the interest of the subject, and in spite of the excellence of the translation (which has been made by Professor E. L. Schaub of Evanston University, Ill.), it is not likely that the expression will find a home among us.

But we may find out what it means. In the German tongue the word is used in two ways. It is used for comparing the psychology of one nation with another—the French with the Germans, the English with the Americans. It is also used to distinguish the psychology of a group of persons from that of individuals. It is in the latter sense that it is used by Professor Wundt.

'*Language*, for example, is not the accidental discovery of an individual; it is the product of peoples, and, generally speaking, there are as many different languages as there are originally distinct peoples. . . . How, again, could a *religion* have been created by an individual? There have, indeed, been religions whose founders were individual men; for example, Christianity, Buddhism, and Islamism. But all these religions rest on earlier foundations; they are elaborations of religious motives arising within particular folk communities. Thus, then, in the analysis of the higher mental processes, folk psychology is an indispensable supplement to the psychology of individual consciousness. Indeed, in the case of some questions the latter already finds itself obliged to fall back on the principles of folk psychology.'

There seems, then, to be good reason for the introduction of such an expression as 'folk psychology' into English. Unfortunately we do not use the word 'folk' as an equivalent to the German 'Völker.' There is a touch for familiarity about it, as well as a flavour of antiquity. And, besides, are we not going to coin our own words in future? Here is an opportunity for the professional philologist—or more likely the man in the street.

Professor Wundt's method is to begin with Primitive Folk, and tell all he knows about their psychology—thought, belief, action—then to proceed to the next stage of development, and again

cover the whole ground. The method is open to arbitrariness, but it is possibly better than to take, say, religion by itself and work it down through all the stages of man's civilization.

WELFARE SUPERVISION.

In spite of the number of trades and professions into which women have entered, we can speak of Welfare Work as a new occupation. It is the supervision of the women in factories while they are at their work. What it signifies for the superintendent, for the factory proprietor, for the workers, is told fully and authoritatively by Miss E. Dorothea Proud, B.A., in a handsome volume entitled *Welfare Work* (Bell; 7s. 6d. net). Miss Proud writes out of abundant personal knowledge and leaves no aspect of the subject untouched; and Mr. Lloyd George, in a pithy foreword, vouches for her right to speak with authority. 'This volume,' he says, 'will be found very helpful to those who desire to do their part in the good work now. We owe it to the good sense, industry, and intelligence of an Australian, Miss E. D. Proud, who, after graduating at the University of Adelaide, has spent many years of patient inquiry and research into the conditions of welfare work as carried on in the factories of the Commonwealth and of Great Britain. She has further served in the Welfare Department at the Ministry of Munitions since its foundation. Her knowledge of Welfare Work is therefore unique, and her book bids fair to become the standard work on the subject. I warmly commend it to employers, to Lady Superintendents, and to all those members of the general public who care for the welfare of the workers in our factories.'

It is evident that the welfare superintendence of factories is not a 'soft job.' There is no conceivable interest of the workers which is not also the interest of the superintendent. The claim upon her is supposed to end with the day's labour; but here we have elaborate rules for the regulation of the food and the amusements of the women.' Perhaps these are voluntary offices: a wise superintendent will understand. But all the superintendents must be wise; how otherwise can they engage or dismiss the workers, hear complaints, settle disputes, insist on cleanliness and care, watch over the health and steadily raise the moral tone of the factory? It is a fascinating occupation

—fascinating because of the very delicacy and multifariousness of its demands. And this is a fascinating book which Miss Proud has written about it.

BETWEEN TWO WARS.

Why do American authors say that the German invasion of Belgium had nothing to do with the entrance of Britain into the War? Professor Herndon Fife, Jr., of Wesleyan University, U.S.A., is one who says so. And yet in his book on *The German Empire between Two Wars* (Macmillan; 6s. 6d. net), he is scrupulously fair towards Britain and towards Germany. He strives hard, and he rarely fails, to hold the balance even. That, and a curious slip about the British crown as 'a mere figurehead,' are the only lapses from the obvious truth that we have found in the whole book. It is so fair indeed, and so well informed, it is written, moreover, in so good a narrative style, that it deserves a wide circulation in this country, and we hope it will obtain it.

Professor Fife is not a historian. He is rather a political and social lecturer. The book may not have been given first as lectures, but again it may, and the whole manner of it suggests that it was. The repetitions suggest the lecture. They are plentiful and amusing. How often does Professor Fife tell us about Wolff's Bureau? How often about the percentage of births to deaths? How often about the *Daily Telegraph* interview with the Kaiser when he submitted his plan for winning the Boer War, which so irritated the docile Germans?

The explanation is that each chapter deals with one topic, and carries that topic right through the forty years. Thus the first chapter traces the history of the relation between Germany and France, the third the rivalry with England; while a later chapter describes the worrying and always worsening attitude of the conquered provinces of Alsace-Lorraine and Schleswig-Holstein to the Government. The method is not scientific, but it makes pleasant reading. The book is pleasant reading throughout. It is also a book to be desired to make one wise.

THE STATE.

'In the months that have passed since the cloud of war burst upon us many have asked in vain for

a certain voice from the Church, may we not say from Christendom as a whole? It is right that the Church should inspire the nation, but its call must be its own. Its members may be convinced that a war is righteous, but the business of the Church is to inspire the nation to fight righteously, not to act as a recruiting sergeant. Its business is to learn and teach the spiritual lessons of the war; to call to penitence; to keep love, even the love of our enemies, alive; to diminish the inevitable suffering; to prepare for a better future in which peace and goodwill may prevail; to strengthen and build up the nation in righteousness. Has any organized Church in Christendom done this? If there should be failure here a tremendous opportunity will have been missed. Let us not blame others for what they may have left undone, but let us remember that we are the Church, to whatever Christian body we may belong, and that the responsibility is with us.'

Who brings that charge against the Churches? It is no enemy. It is the widow of a bishop of London, a woman of great discernment, Mrs. Creighton.

Mrs. Creighton is the author of the first of a series of lectures on *The Theory of the State* which were delivered in connexion with the International Crisis at Bedford College for Women, and are now published under that title (Milford; 4s. 6d. net). The crisis, Viscount Bryce tells us in his Introduction, demands that two things should be done. 'The one is to lead and help our people to know better the facts of the European situation as it stands to-day, including the wishes and aspirations of the various nationalities and the conditions upon which any durable peace must be based, a task to which such organizations as the Council for the Study of International Relations are addressing themselves. The other is to examine, and help the people to examine and comprehend, the theories and doctrines which have been influencing the mind of the nations of continental Europe.' It is to help in the doing of the second thing that these lectures are sent out. The other lecturers are: Professor W. R. Sorley ('The State and Morality'), Professor J. S. Mackenzie ('Might and Right'), Mr. A. D. Lindsay ('The State and Society'), Canon Rashdall ('Egoism, Personal and National'), and Hilda D. Oakeley ('The Idea of a General Will').

THREE OXFORD MOVEMENTS.

The fascination of Oxford is not for its alumni only. It is felt in America. There is a story that a certain American Professor visiting the University asked an official how to obtain a surface on his lawn, and the answer came, Mow it for five hundred years. It is the ancientness that appeals to the American.

It is no surprise to find that Dr. S. Parkes Cadman has made a special and prolonged study of the three Oxford Movements associated with the names of Wycliffe, Wesley, and Newman. On every one of the movements and on every one of the men we have had writing in abundance. Yet there is freshness and even occasional delightful surprise in this fine scholarly book. Its title is *The Three Religious Leaders of Oxford and their Movements* (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net).

The chapter on Wesley was the most difficult to write. Wesley is more familiar to the ordinary reader of books than Wycliffe, yet he is not recent enough to be as attractive psychologically as Newman. And, besides his middle place, he is the father of a great Church, every member of which is susceptible to the least inaccuracy or the least undue emphasis thrown upon any fact or characteristic. Now the chapter on Wesley is the greatest chapter of the three. There is not a word in it that is beyond the understanding of the outsider, for Dr. Parkes Cadman has a fine gift of lucidity; yet his knowledge is minute enough and his judgment sufficiently balanced to meet the scrutiny of the most accomplished and critical of Wesley's sons.

Dr. Parkes Cadman is much drawn to Newman, little to Newmanism, and least of all to the subsequent history of that particular 'Oxford Movement.'

The Australasian Graded Bible Lessons, edited by John Smyth, M.A., D.Phil., will hold their own with any Sunday School, Bible Class, or Guild Handbooks published. The Senior Grade (second year) book is prepared by the Rev. A. R. Osborn, M.A., a scholar by training and a teacher by birth.

Mr. Thomas Baker has issued a fourth edition of *The Dark Night of the Soul* by Saint John of the Cross, one of the greatest though not one of

the longest mystical books of the Middle Ages. The volume is one of that series of translations of the mystics of the Roman Catholic Church to which belongs *The Way of Perfection* of Saint Teresa, and other books which have been noticed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES as they were issued. They are to be commended for the fulness of their introductions as well as for the excellence of the translation.

In issuing this fourth edition the Publisher says: 'Since the issue of the Third Edition, a more correct Spanish text of the whole of the Saint's works has appeared, "Obras del Místico Doctor San Juan de la Cruz. Edición Crítica. Toledo, 1912," edited by the Rev. P. Gerardo de San Juan de la Cruz. Having acquired the sole right of English translation of this edition, I have had the text carefully compared with that of my Third Edition and a translation of all the variants put into their proper places, with the original Spanish given in footnotes.'

There is no book of the Bible which gives a commentator more satisfaction than the First Epistle to the Corinthians. The Rev. R. St. John Parry, D.D., has written the Commentary on *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* in the Cambridge edition of the Revised Version for Schools and Colleges (Camb. Univ. Press; 2s. 6d. net). The Introduction is very full—it runs to 75 pages—and discusses such topics as the Parties or Cliques and the Position of Women, in addition to the usual matters of an Introduction. The Notes are full also. All is scholarly, up to date, reliable, readable.

Only a year ago we received and reviewed a book entitled *The Heart of Jainism*, by Mrs. Sinclair Stevenson. In spite of the ability of that author and the thoroughness of her work, there is room, says Mr. F. W. Thomas, for a work which should furnish, in a moderate compass, an exposition of Jainism and its terminology. Such a work he finds in *Outlines of Jainism*, by Jagmenderlal Jaini, M.A. (Cambridge: At the University Press; 4s. net). It is the first volume of a series which is to be issued by the Jain Literature Society, of which Mr. Thomas is President. Two features of the book deserve particular attention: (1) it contains two elaborate charts, one of the twenty-four Tirthankaras, the other of Karmas and correspond-

ing qualities; and (2) it contains a large number of Jaina texts, with their interpretation.

The latest volume of *The Christian World Pulpit* (Clarke & Co.; 4s. 6d.) is the eighty-ninth. It contains the issues from January to June 1916.

The first thing to observe about it is that the Index of Texts has returned to the alphabetical instead of the Biblical order. It begins with Acts and ends with 2 Thessalonians. Does it mean that the readers of *The Christian World Pulpit* cannot repeat the books of the Bible in order? One curious result is that the four Gospels are turned right round—John, Luke, Mark, Matthew.

But it is a good volume, as good as ever. It opens with a fine sermon by our greatest master of religious language, Professor Scott Holland. And within a few pages we have Dr. John Clifford's able summary of the religious events and influences of 1915. The favourite preacher this time is Dr. Orchard. He is close followed by Dr. Horton.

'It is obvious that the chief aim of sex is union. Now the physical union, e.g. in marriage, is but the type or symbol of the spiritual union. Woman, far from being the inferior, is really the counterpart of man, and was evidently intended by the all-wise Creator and Father to be his comrade or helpmate on life's uphill road. The two half-souls, by means of the mutual interchange of spiritual gifts, elevate and purify each other so that their characters develop more fully and harmoniously.' That is the secret of *How to Complete our Lives* (Fowler). That ideal Bertha Davis has ever before her to the end of the little book, and urges its realization upon us earnestly.

Is it possible to do anything of scientific value with subjects like Auto-Suggestion and Vitalism? That a plausible case can be made out for them is evident. For Messrs. Fowler have issued two attractive volumes, one entitled *Auto-Suggestion: What it is, and How to use it for Health, Happiness, and Success* (2s. 6d.), the other *Vitalism: Being Ten Lessons in Spiritual Healing and the Spiritual Life* (2s. 6d.), and in each volume the subject is set forth with amazing persuasiveness. The author of the first-named book is Herbert A. Parkyn, M.D., C.M., who was once editor of *Suggestion*,

a magazine of the New Psychology. The author of the second is Paul Tyner.

Canon Henry Scott Holland has published a second series of articles from *The Commonwealth*. They are worth republishing; so is everything that Canon Scott Holland writes. Since the opening of the war he has been greater than we knew him—a trusty guide and good comforter to not a few. The title is *So as by Fire* (Wells Gardner; 1s. net, or in cloth, 2s. net).

Mr. J. Gardner Hitt has published *The Layman's Book of the General Assembly of 1916* (2s. 6d. net). It is issued under the auspices of the Elders' Union of the Church of Scotland, and is edited by the Rev. Harry Smith, M.A.

To the ninth edition of the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, Theodore Watts-Dunton (simply Theodore Watts then) contributed the article on Poetry. He was a discovery of Professor Minto of Aberdeen, who was then editing the *Examiner* in London. Minto recommended him to Professor Baynes, who had been appointed editor of the *Encyclopædia* and had been thinking of either Swinburne or Matthew Arnold for the article. Baynes engaged Watts-Dunton. It was a great hit for the book and for the man. Watts-Dunton became known as the most accomplished critic of poetry in the world.

Many years after, Dr. David Patrick, editing the new edition of *Chambers's Cyclopædia of English Literature*, engaged Watts-Dunton to write an Introduction to the third volume. The contribution was called 'The Renaissance of Wonder in English Poetry.' Both of these articles are now republished in a volume entitled *Poetry and the Renaissance of Wonder* (Herbert Jenkins; 5s. net).

There is much more in the volume than the two articles. There is a selection of notes from critical articles contributed through many years to the *Athenæum*. These notes are added to the greater articles as 'Athenæum riders,' and are distinguished from them by being printed in solid type. The device was Watts-Dunton's own. It has a curious effect on the book. But, if not quite successful artistically, it enables us to possess in a single convenient volume all that is best of Watts-Dunton's writings on poetry. Everything in the volume has to do with poetry and everything is good.

Except the proof-reading. But we have never seen a posthumously published book of which the proof-reading was perfect.

Dr. Frank Ballard is an omnivorous reader. He is also a rapid and for the most part victorious writer. And he has his feet upon the Rock. It was inevitable that he should be invited to deliver the Fernley Lecture. It was as inevitable that he should choose as the subject of lecture some apologetic subject. He chose *Christian Reality in Modern Light* (Kelly; 3s. 6d. net).

He did not choose Reality. He did not choose Reality in Religion. He chose Reality in Christ. The lecture is a great and a gracious plea for the truth as it is in Christ Jesus. The theory and the practice are delightfully intermixed, as they ought to be. If we do the will of God we shall know the truth, and as we know the truth we shall be ready to do the will. It is the Gospel as it is to be made applicable to the life of to-day. Few know better than Dr. Ballard the difficulties of the application. Few know better the need. But there is a fine breezy persuasiveness throughout the book, with sometimes a sharp reproof that we can be so perverse as not to be persuaded.

Successful teachers of the Bible are often encouraged to publish their notes or lectures, whereby this form of literature becomes embarrassing by its amount. But now and then the book comes which excels, and compels attention to its excellence. Such a book, outwardly plain and unpretending, is *Lessons on the Life of Jesus Christ as it is recorded in the Gospel of St. Mark*, by the Rev. James Robbie, M.A., B.D., Lecturer in Religious Instruction in the Training College, Dundee (Longmans; 2s. net).

A Study in the Philosophy of Bergson has been made and published by Gustavus Watts Cunningham, A.M., Ph.D., Professor of Philosophy in Middlebury College (Longmans; 5s. net). Bergson's philosophy is worth knowing; Professor Cunningham knows it thoroughly; he writes with lucidity enough to make Bergson's philosophy known to any one who simply reads his book. No doubt there are degrees of knowledge; but the reading of this book will at least make the difference between knowledge and ignorance, and will send the reader to deeper knowledge by the reading of Bergson's

own books. Once Dr. Cunningham puts the philosophy of Bergson into a sentence: 'By means of intuition we can know reality and yet escape mechanism.' 'Such,' he says, 'is the fundamental position of Bergsonism.'

The title of Dr. Maurice Parmelee's book, *Poverty and Social Progress* (Macmillan; 7s. 6d. net), recalls Mr. George's *Progress and Poverty*. And there are other similarities between the books. Both are written by Americans and for Americans; yet both touch world-wide problems and both demand world-wide attention. Dr. Parmelee goes more fully into the problems and writes more cautiously than Mr. George. It must also be said that he has a heavier hand.

Dr. Parmelee is convinced that the poor need not always be with us. But they will always be with his own countrymen unless something is done to restrain competition in labour. For he agrees with Rubinow that 'the American wage worker, notwithstanding his strenuous efforts to adjust wages to these new price conditions, notwithstanding all his strikes, boycotts, and riots, notwithstanding all the picturesque I. W. W. -ism, new unionism, and the modish sabotage, has been losing surely and not even slowly, so that the sum total of economic progress of this country for the last quarter of a century appears to be a loss of from 10 to 15 per cent. in his earning power.'

One remedy for over-competition is to restrict immigration, and this Dr. Parmelee advocates. He has been told that that will be needless for many years to come owing to the necessity which will lie upon the nations of Europe to make good the losses of the war. But he thinks that the actual losses are greatly exaggerated. And he argues that the birth-rate 'will very soon leap forward.' So he advocates the restriction of immigration. The policy is selfish, and he admits it. But he thinks that if the European nations lose in being kept out of America they will gain by the consequent raising of wages, since the rate of wages in one country affects the rate of wages all over the world.

It is only a month or two since we received from the Society for Propagating Christian Knowledge a commentary on the Book of Jonah in which that book was spoken of, and commented on, as 'fiction.' We have just received an introduction

to *The Books of the Pentateuch* by a Professor in the Garrett Biblical Institute of America, and it is entirely in sympathy with recent criticism. The author is Professor F. C. Eiselen. His critical position is almost identical with that of the late Professor Driver. These two facts are encouraging. It can only be by the force of truth that those two conservative institutions have been driven to publish books in which critical results like these are openly advocated.

Professor Eiselen (whose book is published by the Methodist Book Concern at \$1.50 net) has discussed the critical question—all the critical questions—thoroughly and impartially. He gives Professor Orr his due. It is with reluctance that he leaves him at last and settles down beside Driver. The consequence is that he is likely to see his readers settle down there also. For all the facts on both sides are stated and tested, and there seems to be no other way of it.

It sometimes happens that we come upon a book which we think we could have written and wish we had. *The Way of Peace* is such a book (Methuen; 3s. 6d. net). It is written by a woman, Augusta Kirby. There is no sense in the writer of having done a great thing. And perhaps it is not great. But it is as a hand pointing to the way of life; and surely there will be some who by its means will find the way.

Messrs. Morgan & Scott have published *The Secret of Inspiration*, by Andrew Murray, a precious volume of Christian counsel, though made so small as to be carried in the pocket (1s. net).

They have also issued a book on personal religion in relation to the War, by Marshall Broomhall, M.A. The title is *Mine own Vineyard* (1s. net).

By the same publishing house is issued *The Bible View of the World*, by the Rev. Martin Anstey, B.D., M.A. (1s. 6d. net). It is an evangelical writer's thoughts on such ultimate but ever-present things as Religion and Life, Evolution and Creation, Culture and Conversion, Sin and Evil. It is the thoughts of a writer who has made up his mind finally and speaks it fearlessly.

A translation has been made by Mr. Fred Rothwell of *The Contingency of the Laws of Nature* by Émile Boutroux (Open Court; 5s. net). The French book was written as long ago as 1874, and

the author is a little astonished that it should 'create attention after so long an interval.' But when are we likely to lose interest in the question of necessity or free will? And with a clearer understanding of what is meant by the laws of nature we are undoubtedly in a better position now to appreciate Boutroux's argument that the will of man has actual influence on the course of things. He divides philosophical systems into three types, the idealist, materialist, and dualist or parallelist types; and as they all regard the laws of nature as a chain of necessity, he opposes them all. He opposes them also on the ground that they do not go direct to nature and life for their arguments, but combine in more or less novel fashion the arguments already used in previous systems. His great aim is 'to replace a philosophy essentially conceptual by one that is living and is moulded on reality.'

Is it understood that the problem of the Book of Job was settled by that book? M. Étienne Giran does not so understand it. He has tackled the problem as it is to be seen and felt in his own adopted country, which is Holland, and in his own day; and he has offered his solution in *A Modern Job* (Open Court; 2s. 6d. net).

Job is here again, and as troubled as ever. But he has lost something of the dignity with which his trouble was borne by the patriarch. Eliphaz, Bildad, and Zophar are here again also, these names being supposed to be handed down from one generation to another until they are held by these very modern Dutchmen. Each of the friends has his own theological formula, and each tries to fit Job into it, unsuccessfully. Even Elihu is here, but not the Elihu of the Hebrew book. This 'is not a raw youth, claiming to speak by the spirit, yet speaking, however truly and forcibly, from somewhere off that stage of concrete anguish on which the drama of the afflicted soul is played. He is, on the contrary, old in years and in the experience of the life that serves, and serves in the humblest place; and the lore he has learned there has wrought in him the simplicities of the heart of the little child. So it is that his brief word tells, that it is germane to the drama, where the protracted argument of his ancestor is convicted of an irrelevance which betrays its imported character.'

And what is the conclusion of the whole matter?

It is put very tentatively in a question. 'Was God, by opening his eyes to the beauty of his universe, already restoring to him the very treasures of life that blind circumstance had snatched from his grasp?'

Mr. Frederick William Hugh Migeod, F.R.A.I., has spent his manhood among wild beasts and wild men, and from his life among them he has been able to conceive what must have been the life of *Earliest Man*. He has therefore written a book with that title (Kegan Paul; 3s. 6d. net). He has read books on anthropology, and knows what has been discovered about the earliest men; but this is not a bookish book, it is a record of personal investigation.

The Rev. Walter M. Patton, D.D., Professor of Biblical Literature and History of Religion in Carleton College, Northfield, Minn., has written a commentary on Genesis i.-xi., and called it *Israel's Account of the Beginnings* (Boston: Pilgrim Press; \$1 net). Instead of printing the text and explaining it by means of notes below, he has written a paraphrase of each section and thrown his notes to the end. The Priestly Writer's Story of Creation comes first; the Jehovist's Story of Man's Origin and Primitive Life follows. All is in harmony with the best Biblical scholarship of our day. Professor Patton is himself a scholar, able to take rank with the best.

In his Commentary on Romans, the first volume of a series to be called *St. Paul's Letters Unfolded* (R.T.S.; 1s. 6d. net), Dr. A. Lukyn Williams offers the text of the Epistle with the very minimum of explanation—just what is absolutely necessary to understand the reading, what we can imagine Levites of Nehemiah's day offered the Jews when 'they read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense' (Neh 8⁸).

Mr. E. S. P. Haynes is in earnest when he writes on *The Decline of Liberty in England* (Grant Richards; 6s. net). There has been too much legislation of late, he believes; and it has restricted the liberty of the poor man, and especially the poor woman, far more than of the rich man or woman, and far more than is endurable. But as one reads Mr. Haynes's book one sees how difficult it is to draw the line between liberty and licence. Mr.

Haynes is particularly bold in demanding liberty for the sexual and the drinking appetites. What principle has he to go upon? What standard of right and wrong? He demands that the State should have a clear principle and act upon it; but where is it to be found? Not in Christianity. For all that that word denotes Mr. Haynes has a bitter dislike. Take this sentence: 'Laws and customs as to Sunday observance have obsolesced as noticeably as the belief in the Christian religion during the last fifty years; but this does not prevent the "temperance" advocate from urging that no alcoholic liquor should be drunk on Sundays.' It is a great pity that Mr. Haynes has this dislike. He knows the miseries of city life and he is sincerely anxious to relieve them. But his remedy of larger liberty is simple madness unless it is the liberty of the children of God.

Not long ago the Rev. Ernest E. Hull, S.J., published a book called *Why should I be Moral?* His answer was, Because God requires morality. He has now published a book on *Civilisation and Culture* (Sands; 2s. net), in which he shows that progress in civilization is attained by this same recognition of God's claim. This is what he says: 'I know of no sanction which will induce men to practise virtue and abstain from vice habitually and consistently, through thick and thin, for better or for worse, except the sanction of conscience—the recognition that there is a Lord and Master above us, supreme in His rights and in His power to enforce those rights, who has mapped out the way we should walk, and the penalties for straying from the appointed path; whose edict cannot be ignored or contravened with impunity, and from whose hand we cannot by any contrivance escape. Under such a régime virtue is not merely a beautiful thing or a useful thing. It becomes an imperative duty. Vice is not merely an ugly thing and a mischievous thing. It becomes a *sin*—an offence of the Divine Majesty, an outrage of His law, a spoiling of His designs, an abuse of our faculties and of our opportunities, a contradiction of the purpose for which we were created, and a thwarting of our final destiny.'

The Rev. Alfred Plummer, D.D., is one of the most earnest advocates of Prayer for the Dead. He believes that it may be made a great *Consolation in Bereavement*. And under that title he has

published a small book, advocating the practice as eloquently as earnestly (Scott ; 2s. net).

The Preacher's Handbook, by the Rev. F. A. C. Youens, M.A. (Scott ; 2s. 6d. net), contains Sermon Notes and Notes on Sermon Preparation. The author does not miss the opportunity of declaring his own doctrine. In the Sermon Notes he advocates courses of sermons. The first course which he suggests is on Death and the Future Life. When he touches the question of the duration of punishment, he pleads 'very forcibly' for the doctrine that in the end all will be saved.

The story of *S. Brendan the Voyager and his Mystic Quest* is told by Mr. James Wilkie in a book published by the Society of SS. Peter and Paul (2s. 6d. net). It is told in a fine combination of literary grace and antiquarian curiosity. One may learn profitably who S. Brendan was and what he did, or be charmed by the old-world flavour of romance into the pure pleasure of reading.

Among those who have been stirred by the present strife and have been moved to write of the things that will follow after is Mr. R. H. Crompton. He has written on *The Future of Christianity* (Fisher Unwin ; 6s. net).

He has something to say, but he does not say it easily. His ideas regarding the teaching of Jesus and War, if we understand them, are unnecessarily pessimistic. The situation is not so rigid that we may not use force under any circumstances because Jesus said, 'Resist not evil'; nor if we do, is it so certain that we reject the authority of Christ. For He took typical cases to illustrate His great principle; the cases themselves are not principles. Having the principle we apply it as the case comes before us. 'The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life.'

Mr. Malcolm Quin does not believe that this war will be the end of war unless the world accepts that method of making peace which he calls

'Scientific Catholicism.' He is a Roman Catholic, and he believes that Roman Catholicism, including the Pope, must have the chief say in the matter. But Roman Catholicism, as it now is, will not do it. It must be 'transformed, developed, and completed,' by the entrance of ideas and practices which are to be found 'in the Greek Church and in the various Protestant bodies, including Anglicanism.'

And this transformed Catholicism must be scientific. Physical science must add to it its objectiveness, its systematization, its observation, and its theorizing. When this method is added to the Catholic ideal we shall have a force which no nation or combination of nations will be able to gainsay. We shall have the control of a power, partly spiritual and partly material, which will be able to crush any attempt on the part of any nation to disturb the world's peace. Of course all must be settled first, and that will be accomplished when this war is over. Then when all is settled on a basis of reasonable nationality, Scientific Catholicism will keep it there, defying every attempt of greed or ambition to unsettle it.

For this method of maintaining the world's peace Mr. Quin claims an advantage over every other method that has ever been suggested. The book in which he describes and defends it is called *The Problem of Human Peace* (Fisher Unwin ; 7s. 6d. net).

Do we need a new translation of the Quran into English? Muslim scholars say we do, but that we do not know it. Accordingly a company of scholars, Muslims all of them, and convinced believers in Islam, 'which alone, of all religions, can solve the greatest problems of the age by its universality, grandeur, simplicity, and practicality,' have prepared a new translation. It is to contain the Arabic as well as the English, and very full explanatory notes. The work is to be issued in thirty parts at 3s. 6d. each. The title is *The Holy Qur-ān* (Q. Abdullah, 41 Great Russell Street, W.C.).

Reunion with our Own in Another Life.

By THE REV. RAYNER WINTERBOTHAM, M.A., HON. CANON OF ST. MARY'S, EDINBURGH.

THERE is hardly any subject familiarly connected with religion which requires careful examination and re-statement so much as this. So much is asserted, so much more is assumed, for no better reason than that it is desired. The merest shreds of argument, pitifully unconvincing in themselves, are held sufficient to establish positions which are so welcome to the hearers or readers of sermons. All opposition, all hesitation even, is resented with bitter dislike as treason against the one necessary demand of the human heart. Undoubtedly the strength of the position lies here—in the demand of the human heart that it shall find its loved and lost again. This demand is natural, and beautiful. It is closely intertwined with what is most admirable and most lovable in human life and character. It deserves to be treated with the utmost respect and sympathy.

Nevertheless, it ought to be treated—it deserves to be treated—with frankness and honesty: not with pitying indulgence, like a sickly child that must not be 'countered' however unreasonable it be. If as Christians we are to cherish the expectation of 'reunion with our own' as an integral part, the most valued part maybe, of our hope for eternity, we must know on what this hope is based: the hope itself must, like everything else, be subject unto Christ; it must be rooted and grounded in 'the truth as it is in Jesus,' it must be brought into line and touch and vital union with the rest of our faith. No doubt this assertion will be denied by a vast multitude of people; it will be met with the counter-assertion that the expectation of reunion in another life needs no support from creeds or scriptures: that it finds its own proof in the imperative demand of so vast a multitude of men and women, who themselves have loved and lost, who know what it means to them. The nature of this demand will be examined by and by: for the present it is conceded. But we note at once that it is not in any way peculiar to Christians: it is found in its most beautiful and most poignant form amongst people who are just children of nature, who have little or no religious belief: in a word, it is not at all Christian in itself, although it is widely held by Christian people. Now it is obviously an

unfair and misleading thing to mix up desires and expectations of the natural man with the hopes and rewards of Christianity. The former are not for a moment to be scouted, but they stand on a quite different footing from the latter, and require quite different treatment. But this erroneous method is rampant in the religion of to-day. Reunion with our relatives is habitually put upon the same level as reunion with Christ, as though both were part of the Christian faith. In point of fact they spring as expectations from utterly different sources, and must rely for support upon arguments which are absolutely different.

Let us take the Christian position first. There is not a single word in the Creeds, or in the Bible, to support the assertion that we shall find our own again in another world. It is timidly suggested that it may lie hid in the Communion of Saints. Whatever this blessed fellowship may involve of personal knowledge, intercourse, intimacy, hereafter (as to which we know almost nothing), it is clear that it will be based upon a spiritual order. The 'company of heaven' will not be arranged on any system recognized on earth, but according to their advance in holiness and their likeness to Christ. No one will question this: no one will seriously suggest that the Risen with Christ will be *grouped in families* for the high and spiritual ends of the Communion of Saints. There are again those who endeavour to deduce from certain texts the assurance that there will be mutual recognition in the unseen. The effort would be contemptible if it were not so pitiful. To be reduced to *this* in behalf of a great hope! To find in such miserable and paltry sophistries as these the solace of broken hearts! They take, *e.g.*, the parable of Dives and Lazarus, and point out that these departed ones recognized one another across the impassable gulf which separated Hades from Abraham's bosom. They shut their eyes to the obvious fact that our Lord, in telling this story to the Jews, for His own tremendous purposes deliberately adopted the crude materialistic language which then passed current. If we were to accept that picture-language literally it would throw the whole of Christian teaching about the future life into utter confusion.

It is childish as well as dishonest to pick out the statement that the rich man recognized Lazarus, and to ignore the other statement that these disembodied souls had tongues and fingers and were concerned about a drop of water. Who does not see that all this is picture-language most admirably adapted to subserve the great moral lessons of the parable? Equally unconvincing, for an entirely different reason, is the argument (if such it may be called) founded on our Lord's resurrection appearances, coupled with Phil. 3²¹. It would seem that our Lord was recognized only when He wished to be. In any case He was (as far as we may judge) not yet glorified when the Apostles recognized Him. The circumstances of our future resurrection will be very different from His; and it is to the 'body of His glory' that ours are to be conformed. The whole subject of the risen body is so difficult and doubtful that any argument about it must needs be in the highest degree precarious. Dismissing these trifles (for such they really are), the great, outstanding fact is that the New Testament writers have never a word or a thought to bestow upon the subject of recognition in heaven. That they looked forward, and with eagerness, to the rewards of the life to come, is certain. St. Paul was very willing to remain here for the sake of his converts: for himself he had not the slightest doubt that it was 'far better' to depart this life and to be 'with Christ.' Elsewhere he looks forward to receiving a crown of righteousness, but its value to him lay in the fact that the Lord would bestow it on him. It was, of course, no material crown, but the counterpart of the 'Well done, good and faithful servant' of which the Lord Himself had spoken. Always our Lord had spoken in that sense, and in that sense exclusively, as that He Himself, and His companionship, should be *the* reward, *the* joy, of heaven. It is acknowledged no doubt by all that He spoke in this sense, but it is not realized how *exclusively* He spoke in this sense. Not once did He ever allude to our meeting one another hereafter: not once is the subject mentioned by any of the New Testament writers. This absolute silence, on a matter which is bound to employ and interest the natural man, has a tremendous significance. It means that it lies altogether outside the sphere and scope of Christian revelation. But even that is not all. In two directions our Lord set Himself to stem the tide (if I may use the expression) of natural—of family—affection. That this was

never, on any account, to stand in the way of whole-hearted devotion to Himself, He affirmed by the amazing paradox that no one could be His disciple who did not 'hate' his nearest relatives. Clearly as we recognize their paradoxical character, we can hardly even now read the words without a shudder. Certainly they cannot mean less than this, that a Christian must be always ready to renounce and to trample upon his dearest and most sacred family affections, if an absolute loyalty to Christ seems to demand the sacrifice. It has nothing to do *directly* with recognition and reunion hereafter, but *indirectly* it hits very hard indeed that overmastering affection of the natural man for his own which is the real source of the demand to have them again. A man who was attracted to Christ would look at the faces of his dear ones, and then he would say (very honestly, very wisely perhaps), 'No, I cannot be His disciple, I could not under any circumstances throw these over.' The great majority of us—if it *really* came home to us—would have to say the same. But our Lord made it abundantly plain that if any man would be His, he must be prepared to abandon even his wife and children.

In another way He sought to stem the tide of family affection, and that with direct reference to the future life. He declared that there would not be any husbands or wives in heaven because human nature would have become (in that respect) like the angelic. In other words, all that is of sex will have disappeared. His words are plain, and people do not dispute them. Of course (they say) the physical basis of marriage will have gone, but that is no reason why people should not love as dearly as before, or why they should not yearn to find one another again. If, however, what is desired and expected is just the old intimate and exclusive relationship, deprived only of its physical basis, then the question of the Sadducees returns in full force. You cannot get over the fact that numbers of men and women have two or three wives or husbands apiece. And you cannot get over the intolerable difficulty which this one fact would cause, if anything at all resembling the earthly relationship were to revive in heaven. The truth is that, according to the Bible and the Prayer Book, marriages are for time, *not* for eternity; they are for this life only. It may seem to many (who are themselves sincere and noble) that such a view is unworthy of that immortal love of men and women

which they are never tired of glorifying. Let us then consider of what elements married love consists, and ask which of these can really be immortal. First, there is the feeling, varying from raging passion to placid affection, which is directly based upon the physical relationship—which is, in a word, sexual. There is nothing whatever to be said against this, except in deprecation of its excess, but it is agreed that it cannot survive death or the resurrection-change. Secondly, there is (generally) that delightful ‘camaraderie,’ that community of interests and occupations and pre-occupations, which springs up between married people, and does not weaken with age. But this is not in itself religious, and moreover is indirectly rooted in that same physical basis of marriage. No one can give any reason why it should revive in heaven. Thirdly, there is (often) a self-denying, self-sacrificing love, a spiritual product of the marriage bond on its ideal side, which *is* quite fit to survive. It has become fused, so to speak, with the love of Christ. But this, however beautiful it be, however much it may enhance the joy and the blessedness of heaven, is too spiritual, too ‘disembodied’ to justify the common expectation of finding our own again in something very like the old relationships. Such spiritual love exists under all sorts of conditions, and is as common to the unmarried as to the married, to the desolate as to those with many ties. All married love, all love of parents and children, *ought* to grow up into this, but in so growing up it will be changed and glorified into an heavenly counterpart of itself and leave all its earthliness behind. To imagine that husbands and wives, mothers and children, will be husbands and wives, mothers and children, in heaven is simply to prefer human sentiment to Divine truth, to demand of God what has no sanction in His Word, what is contrary to the teaching of Christ, and what is inconsistent with common sense. The woman who has been loving and amiable, faithful and obedient, to two or three (consecutive) husbands cannot be ‘wife,’ in any intelligible sense, to all or any of them hereafter. The mother who has had to leave behind her the child of her love cannot find him again in the grown man who is equally eager to embrace once more his own little ones. However one may try to think the matter out, one *cannot* honestly reconstruct the family grouping in another world. One can only, by successive surrenders, come at last to a purely spiritual affection, stripped

of all ‘domestic’ character, which would not in the very least satisfy the yearning of the natural man to find ‘his own’ again. That is the very crux of the situation. The Christian religion (as it is taught) is desperately anxious to commend itself to what is good and lovable in the eager desires of ordinary people. It is therefore continually engaged in offering to them (without any authority) reunion with their own in heaven. And as continually, when these offers are examined, they are found to be as unsatisfying as they are unauthorized. There is no getting away from that.

We have now a very different task before us: we have to face the fact that natural religion (quite apart from Christianity) demands, not only the immortality of the individual, but in a certain sense the immortality of the family. In the days of barbarism, when a chief was buried his wives and servants were sacrificed on his grave in order that they might still be his in the spirit world. Life there, without these enlargements, would not be worth living. Just as barbarism has been softened and ennobled into our present highly civilized condition, so has that brutal procedure been transformed into the quasi-religious assurance that we shall find again our wives, our children, and our friends in heaven. The instinctive feeling which really lay below is the same. What makes life dear and valuable is its affections, and those affections are centred and embodied in those whom we call our own. Love is stronger than Death: it refuses to give way to him; it persists, with invincible obstinacy, in demanding that its loved ones shall be given back to it. And here we stand, humbly and reverently, before one of the very few universal and fundamental facts of human nature. Love is the greatest thing in the world. Degraded as it everywhere is, it is everywhere capable of flinging off all its degradation, of developing a courage, a purity, a self-devotion which are too beautiful for words. It is impossible to think that true love can die: it *must* be immortal. That is so, and Christianity tells us why it is so. God Himself is love: it is His very essence. Whatsoever, therefore, in human love is pure and unselfish is of God: not only *from* Him, but *of* Him. It cannot possibly die: it must survive, if anything human survive at all. Like most (or all) of the fundamental tenets of true religion, it depends wholly upon the character of God. Its guarantee is simply what God

is, unchangeably, always, everywhere. Love *must* survive: love cannot die, any more than God can. This we acknowledge, not only with conviction, but with eagerness, with an inexpressible thankfulness. It remains to correlate this foundation truth with the expectation of 'reunion with our own.' In the first place, we are bound to acknowledge, what poets and novelists are so eager to prove to us, that true love—love of the unselfish, self-sacrificing order—is found in all manner of human relationships, some of them very irregular, very sinful. There is many a poor fallen woman who will lavish all that she has, or is, upon a worthless man with an 'abandon,' a carelessness of self, a gladness of sacrifice, which might make the angels weep for pity—and for joy. The 'adultery' novel which is so immensely popular to-day may serve to drive home this truth at least, that love does sometimes show its brightest and most heavenly features under the basest conditions. No one, surely, will assert that these irregular and sinful unions, which are so often a cruel wrong to others, will be revived in a better world. But the true love entangled in them must survive—somehow. In the second place, we recall the fact, known by experience to so many of us, that the very truest love has no fulfilment, never becomes 'domestic.' It is a truism that few people marry their first loves. But it is precisely this first love, of early youth, of boy and girl belike, which is most true to the divine original, most pure, most unselfish, most beautiful. It has the ineffable charm and freshness, the stainless purity, of a summer's dawn. There is not anything like it in the world for fragrance, for sweetness. It is as delightful as it is impossible. They go their separate ways, these two, and Time with his slow, kindly healing assuages the bitter pain. Later on they marry other people whom they love well enough; and if they ever meet one another again it is probably with a sense of surprise, of disillusion. Their love had no fulfilment on earth, and can have none in heaven; but the love

itself is immortal, it must survive. It remains for us to acknowledge that no conceivable arrangement or re-arrangement of individuals in any sort of domestic or family grouping would be tolerable in heaven. Love itself will survive, so far as it is true and worthy of God, but love must be wholly disentangled from all that belongs—directly or indirectly—to sex. God Himself made us male and female, made us to be husbands and wives, parents and children—but for this life only. It is under the conditions of sex that love (which is of God) habitually finds its training and its fulfilment here. These conditions are absolutely to cease, and all relations directly or indirectly dependent on them will cease too. All true love will (we know not how, and cannot even guess) be disentangled, and will survive. It will somehow be found again as part and parcel of the love of Christ.

Such a conclusion, founded as it is alike on Scripture and on reason, will not satisfy the many—because what they really want is, not to depart and to be with Christ, but to abide here in the pleasant resting-places they have found. It is very natural. But let them think *this*. Jesus Christ is no stranger to them. They know how kind He was, how sympathetic. He was not one who ever held aloof from the common wants or sorrows of mankind. Once and again He fed the hungry. He helped on the gaiety of that wedding at Cana. He was mindful of His dear mother in His dying hour. He is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. He says indeed nothing whatever about reunion with our loved and lost in heaven. He simply proposes Himself, His Presence, His care, as *the* Prize of our up-calling. Can we not trust Him? Must we not believe that *with Him* God will also give us all other things, and all other people, that we want, so far as is possible, and good, for us? We may not expect the old relationships, or anything like them, but in the companionship of heaven all true love will find room for itself, and room to expand a thousandfold.

In the Study.

What is a Christian?

TOWARDS AN ANTHOLOGY.

JOHN WESLEY.—By a Christian I mean one who so believes in Christ as that sin hath no more dominion over him.—*Letters of John Wesley* (ed. G. Eays), p. 62.

HORACE BUSHNELL.—I never saw so distinctly as now what it is to be a disciple, or what the keynote is of all most Christly experience. I think, too, that I have made my *last* discovery in this mine. First, I was led along into initial experience of God, socially and by force of the blind religious instinct in my nature; second, I was advanced into the clear moral light of Christ and of God, as related to the principle of rectitude; next, or third, I was set on by the inward personal discovery of Christ, and of God as represented in Him; now, fourth, I lay hold of and appropriate the general culminating fact of God's vicarious character in goodness, and of mine to be accomplished in Christ as a follower. My next stage of discovery will be when I drop the body and go home, to be with Christ in the conscious, openly revealed friendship of a soul whose affinities are with Him.—*Life and Letters of Horace Bushnell*, p. 445.

GEORGE WHITEFIELD.—Some place religion in being of this or that communion; more in morality; most in a round of duties; and few, very few, acknowledge it to be, what it really is, a thorough inward change of nature, a divine life, a vital participation of Jesus Christ, an union of the soul with God.—*The Life of the Rev. George Whitefield* (L. Tyerman), i. 96.

JAMES MARTINEAU.—The word Christian has for me a *religious* meaning apart from Creed. Whoever finds his highest in the Mind and Spirit of Jesus Christ and lives in his felt relation of Sonship to God, I should call a Christian; he has the very essence of discipleship, even though he should be brought to this temper of soul indirectly without knowing its Source; just as the Christian Fathers sometimes say that certain of the Pious Heathens were 'Christians before Christ.' The 'Living Test,' therefore, of love, of trust, of holi-

ness *is* in this view that Christian test; and whenever its conditions are complied with, *there* is a 'Christian' indeed, whether he knows it or not.—*Life and Letters of James Martineau* (Drummond and Upton), p. 125.

EDWARD FREEMAN.—I should have thought that, to deserve the name of Christian, a man need not be strictly orthodox—or what do we with Ulfilas?—but that he must do something more than 'admire, respect, or even reverence the character and teaching of Christ.' Every intelligent Mussulman must do that and more; for he must acknowledge Christ as a divinely commissioned teacher, the greatest of such teachers till Mahomet came. But the Mussulman is not a Christian: for he lets Mahomet depose Christ from the first place. I would count as Christian—perhaps only in a kind of secondary sense—every one who held Christ to be the greatest and last of divinely commissioned teachers—I mean divinely commissioned in some sense which I can't exactly explain, but something more than that general sense in which you or I or anybody may be said to be divinely commissioned whenever we do any good thing at all. Is not such an one a Christian, perhaps not a *full* Christian; but surely Christian, as distinguished from Mussulman, Jew, or mere theist?—*Life and Letters of Edward A. Freeman* (Stephens), ii. 213.

P. CARNEGIE SIMPSON.—If one were asked to state in terms what a Christian is, I should say something like this: a Christian is one who is responding to whatever meanings of Christ are, through God's spirit, being brought home to his intellectual or moral conscience.—*The Fact of Christ*, p. 175.

ST. PAUL.—If any man loveth not the Lord, let him be anathema.—1 Co 16²².

HUGH PRICE HUGHES.—When a discussion took place some time ago in the columns of the *Daily Chronicle* on 'Is Christianity Played Out?' the most significant and memorable feature of that controversy was the fact that a number of upright, honest, and sincere persons came forward to defend Christianity under the delusion that they themselves were Christian, although they made a number of ingenuous statements which clearly

showed that they were no more Christians than Confucius or Zoroaster was a Christian. They were moral, they were upright, they had noble aspirations, they accepted the ethical ideal of Christianity so far as they understood it; but they were not Christians. No one is a Christian who does not love the Lord Jesus Christ; and no one can properly love the Lord Jesus Christ who does not enjoy conscious, personal fellowship and intercourse with Him.—*Essential Christianity*, p. 112.

MARCUS DODS.—It is difficult to find any mark which definitely distinguishes the Christian from all others save this, that the Christian is the man who has received the Spirit of Christ. 'If any man,' says Paul, 'have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His.' Every man who has Christ's Spirit is His, is a Christian. All the knowledge that a man needs to make him a Christian is only the knowledge that Christ can and will bestow the Holy Spirit; for the one article of the Christian creed is faith in a now living and supreme Christ. All the action that is required to make a man a Christian is that action which consists in truly depending upon Christ for the Holy Spirit. And all the conduct and that peculiar character which are the proper manifestation of a Christian life do regularly and always result from the acceptance of the Holy Spirit. It is this which distinguishes the Christian from every kind of man, that he looks to Christ and waits upon Him for this greatest of all gifts, the gift of a divine power that can be applied to human nature, and that brings to human nature a life-sustaining, enlightening, and sanctifying energy.—*Christ and Man*, p. 120.

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN.—If the truth must be spoken, what are the humble monk, and the holy nun, and other regulars, as they are called, but Christians after the very pattern given us in Scripture?—*Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, p. 290.

The Seven Words.

II.

The Word of a King.

'To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.'—Lk 23⁴³.

I. CHRIST THE KING.

Christ's first word on the Cross was one of intercession; in it He exercised His function as

High Priest. His second word is a word of promise, by it He anticipates His kingly office, and that also at the very time when His claim to be a King was most subjected to contempt. In the first word He prays that repentance and grace may be given to sinners; in the second He opens the door to a chief among sinners. The first has to do with the kingdom of grace, the second with the kingdom of glory.

1. The penitent thief appeals to Jesus as a King. It is as a King that Jesus suffers. His kingdom is a kingdom of higher glory than belongs to the world. Even while His hands are nailed to the cross He is the King of heaven, and can open its golden gates with a word at His pleasure. The Saviour welcomed this man's homage. He tacitly acknowledged His own lordship over the unseen world. And in a moment the middle cross became the Judge's throne, from which the kingly word is spoken, 'Come, ye blessed of my Father.'

2. Judgment is the first and fundamental function of kings, and Jesus claimed it in its whole extent. To pronounce condemnatory judgment was not His purpose in coming into the world. But judgment was necessarily involved in His coming; the rejection of Him in some sort forestalls the verdict of the last assize; and even here definitive sentence must sometimes be pronounced.

¶ Christ hung upon the Cross at once as Saviour and as Judge. We read that double office in Michael Angelo's picture of the last judgment. The general theme of the picture, and many of its details, were fixed by a tradition two hundred years older than this painter, and the whole spirit of it is strange and repellent to our age. But there is truth in it, and the truth is told with consummate power. It is the crucified Christ who comes upon the clouds to judgment, and the hand once pierced for the salvation of men is stretched forth with a gesture—we are at a loss to define what the gesture is. The general attitude is one which may be traced to the earliest art of the Church. Originally it represented the Teacher proclaiming the gospel. In the early Middle Ages it was interpreted as an act of blessing. The later Middle Ages transformed it into a judgment of condemnation. But never before was this gesture depicted so equivocally as here: it represents the proclamation of that word which either saves or judges, according as men accept or reject it; it signifies at once blessing and ban; with mysterious power it raises up to heaven, it also presses down to hell.¹

II. THE PENITENT.

1. Of all the characters which came into personal contact with Christ, the thief upon the cross stands

¹ W. Lowrie, *Gaudium Crucis*, 32.

alone. He is a type of character often met with to-day. It is the character of a man who, hardened by the guilt and sorrow of a misspent life, still retains that within him which responds to the touch of God's Divine Hand. It is the character of a man, brutalized by his own misdeeds, who, strangely enough, carries beneath his rough exterior a heart which may be softened by a kind and sympathetic word.

The original word used to designate him means more than 'thief.' No commonplace pilferer was he; but a brigand, whose life, in all likelihood, had been one long atrocity, like the life of many a modern brigand in Spain, Italy, or Macedonia. These men were banditti; they belonged to that class, half-criminal, half-patriotic, which abounded in the land of Palestine at that time, and their successors are found even to this day. They were men who had lived unregulated lives; men who were to some degree the heroes of the lower classes of the people. They may have been revolutionaries, whose opposition to the Roman rule had driven them outside the pale of society, where, to win a subsistence, they had to resort to the trade of highwaymen; but in that country, tyrannized over by a despotic foreign power, those who attempted to raise the standard of revolt were sometimes far from ignoble characters, though the necessities of their position betrayed them into acts of violence. But his own words to his companion, 'We receive the due reward of our deeds,' point the other way. His memory was stained with acts for which he acknowledged that death was the lawful penalty.

2. In course of time the bandit's lot had been theirs; society had been too strong for them; the social power had laid its stern hand upon them; they had been dragged to the seat of judgment, and condemned to an ignominious death. And now, as Jesus goes to Calvary, they follow in His footsteps; and with the cross of Jesus are reared two other crosses—it stands not alone upon Mount Calvary, as Christian imagination of necessity too often thinks.

These two crosses are an epitome of the world. There are innumerable points in which one man may differ from another; but fundamentally there are two kinds—those on the right hand, and those on the left. There is between them no sure mark of distinction which men can trace; but the difference is as deep as life. The difference awaits

its revelation: the two walk side by side in the world, *and each alike bears his cross*—a burden, we are prone to forget, which no man may escape, though he may forbear to choose it; but to the one it is the gate of life, to the other the mere instrument of death. Between them, another cross bears the propitiation for the sins of the whole world—intended for all, available for all, though only one will accept it, and the other rails.

3. At first it would seem as though both of His fellow-sufferers were numbered with His foes, for we are distinctly told that the thieves that were crucified with Him joined the scribes and Pharisees, and the Roman soldiers, and the multitude in casting contempt upon Him. The people at the foot of the cross said, 'If thou be the Son of God, come down, and we will believe.' The devil had entered into them, and they were speaking the words of Satan; the same words Satan said when he took Him to the pinnacle of the temple, and said, 'If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down.' 'Come down from the cross, and we will believe.' And when the two thieves heard them blaspheme at the bottom of the cross, they both of them caught up their blasphemy, and cast the same in His teeth.

The weary hours dragged on. One hour passed: two hours passed: the third was passing, and the reproaches were still heard. But a change was coming over one of the thieves—his reproaches were ceasing. He was beginning to feel that this Man was not like other men; there was a majesty, a solemnity in His demeanour not found in others. Besides, death was coming closer and closer, and there is ever clear vision when we judge ourselves in the presence of death. Ribaldry vanishes, our jests cease, when we stand face to face with it. The robber, as he died, saw two things in clearer light—his own sin and this wonderful Saviour. The panorama of his life passed swiftly before him as before the eyes of the drowning; but in this horror he saw a Hand which, if only it might grip him, would be his salvation. At length he expostulates with his fellow-robber. With fury, and in the pangs of fear, this man said rudely and roughly to our Lord, 'If thou be Christ, save thyself and us.' Who defends Him now? The other robber. He says to the reviler, 'Dost not thou fear God, seeing thou art in the same condemnation? And we indeed justly; for we receive the due reward of our deeds: but this man hath done nothing amiss.'

¶ What was it converted him? Was it that he heard Him say, 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do,' and though he had never heard any one put to death say such words of the executioners, was it that? Was it that he read the little gospel over the top of the Cross, 'Jesus of Nazareth, the King of the Jews,' which Pilate had properly put there? He must have turned his head and looked on the Lord Himself. That is what converted him, and that is what converts every soul that learns to love the Saviour. His words are beautiful, His miracles are wonderful, but there is nothing like Jesus Christ Himself. It was *Himself*. He looked and he saw Him. It was the look of the Crucified One. There was something about Him. He looked at Christ, and Christ looked at him. And, just as when Peter blasphemed in the Judgment Hall, he, Peter, looked at Christ and found Christ looking at him (for Peter would never have known that He looked at him, if he had not been looking at Christ), and broke out into tears, so the suffering thief turned round and looked at Christ, and saw Christ looking at him. And there is life in a look from the Crucified.¹

4. There are three characteristics to be noticed in the penitent thief.

(1) *His penitence*.—The penitent robber not only confesses his sins—they were obvious; but he acknowledges the justice of his penance. Enduring the most excruciating sufferings upon his cross, he has the grace to say, 'And we indeed justly; for we receive the due reward of our deeds: but this man hath done nothing amiss.' This is true penitence. Penitence which stops short of confession of sins is, of course, no penitence at all. And penitence which confesses sin, but strives to justify self, and is unwilling to bear the penance or consequences of sin, is not true penitence. The penitent robber not only confessed his sin, but acknowledged the justice of his punishment.

¶ With the majority of us repentance is a slow and laborious process; here it is swift as it is royal. His recorded words contain all the elements of that sorrow of soul which is the preface to peace and joy. He separates himself from his former companion in sin and rebukes him with quiet, selfless dignity. He vindicates the righteousness of Christ and bows his spirit in simple faith at the feet of the King. His sense of unworthiness allows him to ask but little even of a king—only that he may not be forgotten. Christ rewards his penitence by blessing him with a benediction so full that it blesses all ages with its consoling touch.²

(2) *His faith*.—We are apt sometimes to speak almost patronizingly of the penitent thief, but, if we think over it, there has hardly ever been such a magnificent display of faith as was shown in that prayer. Never rose faith higher among the sons of

men than this of the poor malefactor. As far as appearance went, it was prayer to a mere man nailed on a cross—a man condemned, helpless, dying. Yet the boon he asked for was one which could be granted only by the power and mercy of God. Viewed in all its aspects, it was the strongest exhibition of faith in the history of Christianity. It began at a time when Jesus was at the lowest depth of human abasement; it was fostered under circumstances the most repulsive and disheartening, and was consummated by Jesus Himself, in a manner such as never before occurred, and never again can occur, in the annals of redemption.

¶ It would almost seem as if at this particular moment this same thief was the only firm believer on the Saviour. The disciples had all forsaken Him and fled; and, though one of them had at last recovered himself, and was now near the Cross, and though the faithful women had kept close to Him through all that morning's agony, yet it was tender human love rather than genuine faith which brought and kept them near. Even they seemed for the time to have given up as lost the cherished idea of the kingdom. They trusted it had been He who should have redeemed Israel; but now that trust is being dissolved amid the agonies of the crucifixion.³

¶ Therefore, says S. Augustine, 'What fruit Christ obtained in him, as from a dry tree, his faith surpassed that of the Patriarchs and Prophets, even of the Father of the Faithful himself. Moses believed, but he saw the Burning Bush, and the Vision of Sinai. Isaiah believed, but he saw Him on His throne high and lifted up while before Him stood the Seraphim. Ezekiel, but he saw Him sitting over-against the Cherubim. Zechariah, but he saw the Lord sitting as a Priest upon His Throne. But this poor felon saw Him numbered among the transgressors, yet prayed to Him as if He was in glory: on the cross he worshipped Him as though He, as God, sat in heaven; he saw Him condemned, but he invoked Him as the King!'⁴

(3) *His courage*.—The third thing which commands our respect and our affection is the courage of the penitent thief. It must have needed courage to give up his friend, to confess publicly, in the presence of the mocking, deriding mob, that he alone in all that crowd believed in Christ, in His Godhead; courage to say, 'Remember me'—me a sinner, a thief, a malefactor, a well-known criminal, perhaps—'remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.'

¶ A sudden death occurring in the neighbourhood from cholera, Hudson Taylor made the most of the opportunity to urge the importance of immediate salvation from sin and its eternal consequences. A few days later he alluded to the circumstances again, asking if any of his hearers had definitely

¹ *Father Stanton's Last Sermons in S. Alban's, Holborn*, p. 50.

² C. H. Brent, *The Consolations of the Cross*, 16.

³ J. M. Gibson, *A Strong City*, 121.

⁴ S. J. Stone, *Parochial Sermons*, 165.

come to God for pardon through faith in Jesus Christ. Pausing a moment, perhaps hardly expecting an answer, what was his thankfulness when Kuei-hua the young cook said earnestly, 'I have.'

This open confession before his fellow-servants meant a great deal.

'I do hope,' wrote Hudson Taylor, 'that he is under the influence of the Holy Spirit. Though not without faults, he is greatly changed for the better. For some months we have not detected him in falsehood or dishonesty of any kind, which is saying a good deal.'¹

III. THE PETITION.

The difference between the two thieves appeared not in their words but in their tone of voice. The voice interpreted the words. One of them prayed, 'If thou be Christ, save thyself and us'; the other prayed, 'Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.' Which of those prayers was prayed in derision? Which was prayed in faith? The words do not tell us. The meaning was revealed by the face and the voice.

1. The words of the prayer are few, but their meaning is great. They cover a large amount of faith and hope and love. By addressing one who was dying beside him as a malefactor with the title 'Lord,' the thief showed that he recognized Jesus' superiority to all present appearances. By speaking of His 'kingdom,' he virtually asserted that Jesus was a king and had a kingdom. By asking to be remembered when He came into His kingdom, he showed that he believed that our Lord was the dispenser of favours in that kingdom. By making this appeal to a dying man, it proved that he knew that this kingdom was in the future world. As in his rebuke to his fellow-thief there comes out very clearly his repentance of his own sin, and his turning away from it, so by this appeal to Jesus there comes out his strong faith in Jesus as King over a spiritual kingdom, and as the rewarder of those who love and serve Him.

¶ The robber's prayer must have been very comforting to Jesus. He had heard all forenoon only words of insult and scorn and blasphemy; so that this humble, gentle utterance must have fallen on His ear like a song in the night, and dropped upon His fainting spirit like a cordial. Perhaps this prayer brought Him the best help that He ever received from any human being, seeing that it reached Him at the moment when He most required it. Already He was beginning to see of the travail of His soul, and to gather in the fruits of it.²

2. What did this man pray for? His companion, when he spoke to Jesus, said, 'If thou be the Christ, save thyself,' and so on; all his concern was about physical things, physical pain, temporal, bodily things—a prolongation of His earthly life; that is as far as his thought or prayer travels. But this man has ceased to think of any prolongation of his earthly, sinful life; he does not ask that one pang of pain shall be removed. If he believed that that mysterious Saviour hanging there, almost within arm's reach of him, had power and authority to take his spirit into a paradise in another world, he would surely believe He could ease him of pain if He wished. The whole weight of emphasis, and need, and concern, and prayer were not on the body or this world at all. He has ceased to think of things temporal; his one concern is the things and the place eternal.

¶ Notice the humility of the request. He did not say, 'Take me with Thee'; he did not say, 'Reward me'; he simply said, 'Remember me; let it not be for nothing that I have hung by Thy side. I, a poor, guilty wretch, have been privileged for a moment to look upon Thy beauty, and to rejoice in Thy innocence; oh, remember me, remember me.'³

IV. THE ANSWER.

Before this our Lord had answered no one. But no one had spoken to Him as this man did. The passers-by had that morning mocked and taunted Jesus, and even the chief priests and elders had joined in the unlovely chorus. The Divine Sufferer, however, had maintained unbroken silence until He replied to the penitent malefactor.

1. The word of Christ in response to that great cry of faith was the word of a King. *Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.* 'Thou shalt be with me.' In that promise there is nothing of the hesitation or faltering or qualification with which we must needs, too often, comfort the sinful and departing soul. For we cannot read men's inmost hearts, or gauge the measure of their responsibility; we know little of the conditions of the world which awaits them beyond the grave. But Christ knew all, knows all. *Verily I say unto thee, To-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise.* This is the same voice of power which made all men wonder when they heard Him speak with calm confidence of the purposes of God and the destiny and duty of men. *He taught as One having authority.*

¹ Hudson Taylor in *Early Years*, 305.

² C. Jerdan, *For the Lord's Table*, 197.

³ M. Creighton, *Lessons from the Cross*, 91.

¶ Perhaps in no other saying does Jesus so strongly witness to Himself as the Christ. In beautiful silence He hears theailer, leaving him to be reproved by the echo of his own words; in beautiful speech He answers the prayer of the penitent, and promises more than is asked. Was the promise but an empty word? The heart of the ages has confessed, if Jesus was ever real it was now. He who after such a life could so speak in the face of death to the dying must hold the keys of paradise; and if He could open it then, what must He be able to do now? ¹

2. Christ's gift to him is the entire absolution of the penitent, the assurance of a speedy entrance into the Paradise of God, the pledge of fellowship in the joy of his Lord. It is no cheap gift. When we are tempted to think lightly of the forgiveness which Christ bestows, let us remember that Calvary was the price which both the Giver and the receiver had to pay for this absolution. It was the Cross of Jesus that opened the gate of Paradise.

There are three promises in the answer.

(1) *To-day*.—The robber was thinking of some date far off when Christ might intervene in his behalf, but Christ says, 'To-day.' This was a prophecy that he would die that day, and not be allowed to linger for days, as crucified persons often were; and this was fulfilled. But it was, besides, a promise that as soon as death launched him out of time into eternity, Christ would be waiting there to receive him.

(2) *With me*.—The loneliness of death is a large part of its terror. Human love and friendship will not avail us at the moment of parting. We must die alone, and pass alone into that world beyond, of which we know nothing. That is its dread. But His promise is, 'Thou shalt be with me.' His companionship is promised beyond the gates of death, in that unknown land where we shall await the judgment.

It was not Paradise, a blissful place, nor remembrance, favour bestowed, that he needed, but the presence and fellowship of Christ. And so Christ would go with him, and continue to share the lot that had befallen them together. This was help indeed—life joined to life, conditions shared, a common destiny; what more than this can one man do for another!

(3) *In Paradise*.—Paradise is a Persian word, and means a garden about a palace. The Jews adopted it as the name for the place of Departed Spirits in which reposed the just, whereas Sheol is the place in which the unjust are tossing till Judg-

ment, when they would be cast into Hell, Gehenna. Paradise is not heaven, it is the outer court of heaven, the garden of delight about the Palace of God, and therein the just repose till the judgment, when they will be admitted into the Palace itself. At the gate of the Garden Abraham is seated, and he recognizes and receives his sons. Therefore Paradise is also called Abraham's bosom, or bed. Through the Garden flows the river of the water of life. This gladdening stream never leaves Paradise, and the souls in Sheol yearn in vain for a drop of water therefrom with which to cool their tongues. Our Lord, both in the Parable of Lazarus and Dives and in His word to the penitent thief, accepts the prevalent doctrine and gives it His seal.

¶ We need not distract our thoughts by wondering of what it consists, nor whether we shall be happy there, if we ever are allowed to go there. The whole essence of Paradise is to be with Christ! Even now on earth what does it matter where we are, what does it matter what we have? The whole essence of happiness is to be with those we love—that is all that human happiness consists in—and therefore it is enough to believe that our dear ones are with Christ. It is enough to believe, if by God's infinite mercies we are allowed to go there, that we shall spend that blessed time after death at the feet of Christ in Paradise.²

LITERATURE.

- Alexander, W., *Verbum Crucis* (1893), 41.
 Baring-Gould, S., *The Seven Last Words* (1884), 15.
 Benson, R. M., *The Final Passover*, iii. pt. ii. (1893), 281.
 Bernard, J. H., *Verba Crucis* (1915), 19.
 Brent, C. H., *The Consolations of the Cross* (1904), 15.
 Church, R. W., *Village Sermons*, ii. (1894), 135.
 Clow, W. M., *The Day of the Cross* (1909).
 Creighton, M., *Lessons from the Cross* (1898), 88.
 Davies, J. A., *Seven Words of Love* (1895), 12.
 Dixon, H. T., *The Power of the Cross* (1911), 26.
 Gammack, A. J., *Good Friday* (1904), 13.
 Gay, J., *The Seven Sayings from the Cross* (1901), 33.
 Gibson, J. M., *A Strong City* (1899), 121.
 Hodges, G., *The Cross and Passion* (1915), 21.
 Holland, C., *Gleanings from a Ministry of Fifty Years* (1890), 306.
 Hutchieson, F. L., *The Great Oblation*, 43.
 Ingram, A. F. W., *Addresses in Holy Week* (1902), 66.
 Jerdan, C., *For the Lord's Table* (1899), 187.
 Keble, J., *Sermons for the Christian Year: Holy Week* (1876), 258.
 Lilley, A. L., *Nature and Supernature* (1911), 183.
 Lowrie, W., *Gaudium Crucis* (1905), 20.
 Macleod, A., *A Man's Gift* (1895), 131.
 Mortimer, A. G., *The Seven Last Words of our Most Holy Redeemer* (1896).

² A. F. W. Ingram, *Addresses in Holy Week*, 70.

¹ A. M. Fairbairn, in *The Expositor*, 1st Ser., xii. 373.

- Mortimer, A. G., *Lenten Preaching* (1901), 187.
 „ „ *The Chief Virtues of Man* (1904), 31.
 „ „ *Jesus and the Resurrection* (1898).
 Newman, W., *Meditations on the Seven Last Words* (1893), 31.
 Nicoll, W. R., *Seven Words from the Cross*, 15.
 Paget, F. E., *Helps and Hindrances to the Christian Life*, i. (1906) 160.
 Simpson, J. G., *Christus Crucifixus* (1909), 256.
 Stalker, J., *The Trial and Death of Jesus Christ* (1894), 190.
 Stanford, C., *Voices from Calvary* (1893), 95.
 Stanton, A. H., *Last Sermons in S. Alban's, Holborn* (1915), 148.
 Stevens, W. B., in *Living Voices of Living Men* (1888), 143.
 Stone, S. J., *Parochial Sermons* (1901), 155.
 Vaughan, B., *Society, Sin, and the Saviour* (1908), 194.
 Wilkinson, J. B., *Mission Sermons*, iii. (1874), 138.
Christian World Pulpit, xxxvii. (1890) 264 (T. T. Munger);
 xlv. (1894) 113 (G. Body); lxxiii. (1908) 275 (A. F. W. Ingram).
Churchman's Pulpit: Good Friday and Easter Even, vii. 73 (G. T. Shettle).
Expositor, 1st Ser., xii. (1880) 356 (A. M. Fairbairn).
Expository Times, xix. (1907) 448.
Free Church Year Book, 1910, p. 114 (W. R. Lane).
Literary Churchman, xxii. (1876) 100.

Virginitus Puerisque.

I.

November.

'Search me, O God, and know my heart . . . and see if there be any wicked way in me.'—Ps 139²³.

As you all know, there are a great many formalities connected with the opening of Parliament. I wonder if you know of a specially weird one of which I heard the other day. It has to do with this month of November, and sounds like a bit out of one of your own fairy-tale books.

Whenever a new Parliament assembles, first an officer and a troop of the Yeomen of the Guard go with lanterns and search the cellars underneath, and when they report that all is well, business proceeds. A strange old procession it must be: the Yeomen of the Guard with their scarlet tunics and quaint hats, their lanterns flashing searchlights into the dark corners; tramp, tramp, tramp, we can imagine them passing through the cellars.

How the custom began is quite an old story. More than three hundred years ago, a plot was formed to destroy the House of Lords, the King, and his Parliament. One man who had a great deal to do with it and at last became the leader in

carrying it out, was called Guy Fawkes. Under the House of Lords was a great vault which Fawkes and his friends discovered was To Let. They managed to obtain possession of it under the pretext of storing wood. Instead of doing that, however, they got a great many barrels of gunpowder, placed stones and bars of iron on the top of them, and then covered the whole with billets of wood. I do not need to tell you that Guy Fawkes and his confederates were caught and condemned to death. The fifth of November, the day on which they had planned to carry out their wicked designs, was henceforth ordered to be kept as a day of thanksgiving, and to this day English children are reminded of the story by seeing bonfires and fireworks; perhaps also the effigy of Fawkes burned at some street corner. It is a good thing if they do not get their own clothes and fingers burned as well.

I dare say you will wonder what connexion there could be between this story of Guy Fawkes and our text. There is none. But the things that happen in this world often turn people's minds to the life that is unseen. A poet one day watched the reapers, and when he went home he wrote about the 'Reaper whose name is Death.' A man hears a quarry horn blown, and the thought of God's silent warnings of life's dangers passes through his mind.

Those old cellars at Westminster are, in a manner, like your heart. God meant the heart of a boy or a girl to be a beautiful place—more beautiful than the Houses of Parliament. He made them that He might dwell in them Himself. He reigns there now, and holds council with you, telling what is right and what is wrong. But there are cellars and dark corners where evil is plotted against God and against His Son Jesus Christ. Often this evil is suggested with words as pleasant and as affable as Guy Fawkes used when he went with his firewood story. He did not go and say, 'Let me the cellars that I may blow up the House.' Neither do you hear a voice within you saying, 'Tell a lie.' Untruth appears dressed as worldly wisdom. 'If you want to get everything out of a certain boy who is in the class with you, use the wisdom of the serpent; work upon his weak points; he will yield.' Again the voice of evil suggests: 'You have a right to your own things,' and you act towards a little brother very selfishly. Or you read a story you ought not to read, and

try to make yourself believe that you are seeking knowledge.

Your mother knew about the cellars and the evil that lurks in their strange dark corners when she taught you to say your prayers. Prayer is needed. What seem to you but little sins are in reality as dangerous as gunpowder. Unless you seek them out, one day you may yield to some sudden temptation, and the house in which Jesus Christ was to dwell will fall in ruins.

Let us get the lanterns and search everywhere. These may be your mother's words, the words of Jesus Christ, and God's voice in your heart. Don't be afraid to use them when you are by yourself.

A Roman tribune had a house that in many places lay exposed to the eyes of the neighbourhood. A man came, and offered, for a sum of money, so to alter it as to remove that inconvenience. 'I will give you a sum of money,' was the answer, 'if you can make my house conspicuous in every room of it, that all the city may see after what manner I live.' That was the right spirit.

It is impossible for us to search our own hearts thoroughly. One morning we think the evil is gone; we make up our minds we will never be selfish or untruthful again; but temptations only reappear, and in a new and more subtle form.

God will help us. Many a time you have heard that no one ever truly prayed to Him in vain. Ask God, then, to help you to search out the evil in your heart. Pray this old-fashioned prayer:

'Search me, O God, and see if there be any wicked way in me.'

II.

Wise or Otherwise.

'Be not wise in your own conceits.'—Ro 12¹⁶.

The other day I visited a farmyard. Near the barn a mother-hen was clucking softly to a fine brood of chickens as she taught them to pick up seeds of grain. In the mill-lade a few young ducklings were enjoying their first lessons in swimming. But up and down before the farmhouse strutted a large turkey. His tail was well spread out and he thought himself a very fine fellow indeed, but when he spoke his voice was by no means musical, and as he swaggered along I thought, 'Poor old man, you imagine the place

belongs to you and that you are the most important person on the farm, but you'll be sadly disillusioned when you find yourself in a pot next Christmas!'

Perhaps you'll think it a funny thing to get a text from a turkey, but that silly young bird really gave me a text, so he has done some good after all besides providing somebody's future Christmas dinner. 'Conceited as a turkey-cock,' we say, and then the words that St. Paul wrote to the Christians in Rome came into my mind, 'Be not wise in your own conceits.' The Greek words just mean, 'Be not wise at your own bar,' that is, the bar of your own judgment. Don't be too pleased with yourself, thinking that you are always right and that you know everything that's worth knowing. In other words, don't have too good an opinion of yourself.

Now please notice carefully, I didn't say 'Don't have a *good opinion* of yourself,' but 'Don't have *too good an opinion* of yourself.' It's not at all a bad thing to have a good opinion of ourselves, to have a just pride in ourselves. The boys and girls who have the right kind of pride will be kept from doing many mean and unworthy things. But having too good an opinion of ourselves is another matter. It means puffing ourselves up to believe that we are what we are not, that we know everything when we know next to nothing, and if we only thought of it, it makes us look just as ludicrous as that silly turkey in the farmyard.

I am going to give you three reasons why we should not be wise in our own conceits, and I shall give you the least good reason first and end with the best.

The first reason is that *we shall get ourselves disliked*. There is no more detested person than the one who thinks he *knows* much better or *is* much better than anybody else, and that everybody else who thinks differently is wrong. A wise Chinese writer once said, 'Be strictly correct yourself; but do not cut and carve other people.' If all the flowers were the same colour the world would be a very uninteresting place, and if everybody thought alike it would be a very dull one. Certainly have your own opinion, but always give the other boy or girl the right to hold theirs, and be ready to own sometimes that they are right and you are wrong.

And the second reason is, that if we are wise in our own conceits *it will hinder us from learning*.

It's a curious thing, but you will find as you go through the world that the people who know most are generally those who think they know least. And the reason is, that they are the people who have found out how much there really is to know. A great pianist feels how difficult it is to do justice to the beauty of the music he is playing, a great artist how impossible to represent all the beauty he sees.

Once a cardinal was walking in one of the streets of Rome, and he met an old bent man trudging along in the snow. 'Where are you going,' said the cardinal. 'To the school of sculpture,' replied the other. The old man was none other than Michael Angelo, the famous sculptor who carved some of the most beautiful statues in the world. Yet, though he could teach the world, he was ready to be taught.

So don't be ashamed to learn. It's the people who recognize their ignorance who get on. Every day we live in this wonderful world there is something new to learn if we keep our minds open to receive it. And don't think you know better than people who have lived half a century. Your father and mother may not be so well able as you are to conjugate a Latin verb or translate a French sentence, but they know a great deal more of the things that are really worth knowing, and you will never regret it later if you respect their opinions now.

But the last reason is the biggest, and though you forget the others, try to remember this one, 'Be not wise in your own conceits,' because *pride and self-conceit keep us away from Christ*. It was pride that kept the Jews away from Christ. They thought they knew so much better than He did, and they would not listen to His message. And it is pride that may keep us away from Him too. He does not ask that those who come to Him should be good or wise, but if we wish to be His disciples we must lay ourselves like little children at His feet, knowing nothing, trusting not in our own goodness or power. Then He will lift us up and give us the knowledge that is true wisdom, the love that is true strength.

III.

Sunshine.

The Rev. John Wood, F.R.G.S., has issued *One Hundred More Talks with Boys and Girls*

(Allenson; 2s. net). This is one of the new 'talks':

"When you come into the house, do you bring sunshine with you?" is the query that heads the twenty-first of December—the shortest and darkest day of the year—in a modern birthday book.

'Surely that is the day that needs the sunshine most. Anyone can bring in the sunshine from outdoors upon a radiant day in June, for example. The test is to bring it in on the darkest day of the year.

'Now, you all know young people who come into the house with a sullen slam, and bring all the drizzle and darkness of a December storm in with them. They are irritable and complaining, and they make those in the home unhappy. If they have good manners, their fathers and mothers and brothers and sisters don't know it.

'When you come into the house, do you bring sunshine with you? Every young disciple striving to serve Jesus Christ and follow the upward way to heaven should keep this question in mind every day, until it can be answered satisfactorily.

'To live in the sunshine of cheerfulness, to keep our lives in the sunshine of heaven, will keep us useful, sweet, and healthful.

'A pleasant story of Ralph Waldo Emerson runs to the effect that, when Mr. Emerson was travelling in Egypt with his daughter, they met an Englishman who did all in his power to make it pleasant for them, and when the time came for their separation, said: 'You may wonder, sir, at my having overstepped my usual reserve, so far as to become so intimate with you; but it is for the sake of a countryman of yours, one bearing the name—Emerson—Ralph Waldo Emerson. He has done me much good, and I hope sometime to cross the ocean to meet him.' And Mr. Emerson never told him, it was he himself, whom he sought.

'That Englishman, boys and girls, showed kindness to Emerson without knowing it, for Emerson's sake.

'There is a greater than Ralph Waldo Emerson, and He is the Son of God, Who loves you. Love Him in return, and manifest His spirit—for His sake.'

Point and Illustration.

On the Russian Front.

As journalistic writer and photographer for the *Sphere*, Mr. R. Scotland Liddell went through the great retreat with the Russian armies in the autumn of 1915. He has now written the connected narrative of his experiences in that retreat, and the narrative is sufficiently arresting. Mr. Liddell has a style of his own, befitting the individuality of his character. He is clear of all egotism, so clear that he can tell the story of his own doings as naturally as he can tell of the deeds of any other. And his own personal presence gives just that touch of continuity and curiosity to the book which compels the reader to read right on to the end.

Mr. Liddell has a way of dropping facts upon his page which arrest by their isolation. Like this: 'In time of war, each Russian regiment is formed of four thousand soldiers. One Russian regiment, after a year of war, had already had thirty-six thousand men in its ranks. Can I write anything more tragic than that?'

In this way he gives us glimpses of the character of the Russian soldier, and they are more vivid because they are glimpses. 'On the night of Tuesday, July 6, the Germans on the Bzura-Rawka front fired gas shells against the Russians for the second time. The first occasion was five weeks before. The battle scene during the night was wonderful. The flashes of the artillery fire were like gleams of lightning in the sky. The boom of the guns was continuous. The shrapnels burst in fours with spurts of orange flame. I did not sleep. I stood in the open air and watched the spectacle. In the early morning the poisoned men were brought out of the deadly area of the trenches, gasping for air. The 21st Siberian Regiment of four thousand men had seven hundred left when daylight came. Three thousand three hundred men were dead or poisoned. Yet each man was supposed to have a respirator, and each respirator was said to be gas-proof. The officers were confident of this; they were confident of their readiness to fight against the foul fumes. Each man had goggles, also—worn on the peak of his cap, so as to be ready for use—to save his eyes from the penetrating acid. I discussed the heavy percentage of losses with an officer on whose word I can depend.

"But I thought the men had respirators?" I said.

'He assured me that every man had one, and that the men had been ordered to have them ready for wear.

"Then why?" said I.

'He shrugged his shoulders.

"Russia's a queer country," he said, "there are things you'll never understand. The men were not ordered to put them on."

'I tell of this instance as it was told to me. I confess that in spite of my officer friend's reliability, I was inclined at first to doubt his word. Later on, some days after, I mentioned the matter to some other officers of high rank.

"But that could never be?" I said.

"It's possible," said they.'

In the same way he gives glimpses of himself: 'I attended to one man for six hours. I am sure I saved his life. The doctors had practically given him up when I happened to come to the stretcher on which he was lying. For some reason or other—I do not know what—I took a sudden liking to the man. I applied artificial respiration for an hour. It was very tiring work. I ached all over, but I had the satisfaction of seeing the man begin to breathe a little easier. Afterwards I bathed his head and breast and nursed him as best I could for other five hours. By the end of that time he was able to have food and tea. He also smoked a cigarette quite contentedly, and was inclined to sulk when I refused to give him any more. He managed to walk to the train in which he was able to travel to Zyrardow.'

Mr. Liddell is an admirer of the Russian Sisters. They are all good-looking. They have sometimes wit. Here is an illustration of the text, 'Be sure your sin will find you out.' 'I travelled back to Pruszkow in one of the sanitary wagons. Sixteen wounded soldiers were in it, with a pretty Sister in attendance. Four other soldiers came with us also. One of them had a bundle of lengths of cloth which he had secured from the big Zyrardow factory. He gloated over his booty, stroking the cloth with his hand, feeling its softness against his cheek, and admiring the colours and the texture in the dim light of a candle-lit lantern. He showed one piece of cloth to the Sister. It had been intended to be cut up for towels for the use of the employees in the factory. Every foot there appeared some words in Polish. I did not under-

stand what they were, neither did the soldier, but the Sister read them and laughed. "Stolen from the Zyradow Factory" was what the notice was.'

The title of the book is *On the Russian Front* (Simpkin; 8s. 6d. net).

Dream Comrades.

For the writing of imaginary articles—articles in which the might-have-beens are more than the have-beens and are—something other than industry is required. Has Mr. Leonard Green that something? Let two of the shortest of the sketches in his *Dream Comrades* (Blackwell; 2s. 6d. net) be offered to judge by. The first is a

FABLE.

There was once a young man who had vision of the Thing-that-matters.

And he tried to tell people of the wonder of it, of the mystery, and of its beautiful colour.

At first they were charmed: for he was comely and lovable, and they thought he was weaving a fantasy.

But when they found that he was sincere, they laughed: then they hated him.

Their laugh made him bitter. But their hatred renewed the vision.

Fortunately at this point he died.

We have no leisure for enthusiasts who take themselves seriously.

The second is:

THE CYNIC.

The cynic is he, who, having drawn back in fear from the unspeakable heights to which he knows he has been called, persuades himself that they are not only unspeakable but ridiculous.

Wesley's Letters.

Mr. George Eayrs, F.R.Hist.S., who, along with Dr. Townsend and Dr. Workman, edited *A New History of Methodism*, has now, alone, edited a selection of *Letters of John Wesley* (Hodder & Stoughton; 10s. 6d. net). He has so edited them that all is done that can be done to attract us to the reading of them. He has given a title to each letter—usually some phrase from the letter itself; and he has introduced each letter with hints of

time, and place, and circumstance, sometimes also quality. No doubt the question had to be settled: For whom? Mr. Eayrs decided: For the unlearned and ignorant. In every respect the volume is one to draw to the reading of John Wesley's letters and thereby to John Wesley himself, and thereby to Christ, the—what shall he be called?—the man in the street. The man who will not read this book will read no good thing.

Some of the letters have never before been published; others only partly: the rest are taken from Tyerman's *Life* or Jackson's *Works of Wesley*, or other less accessible sources. But the point which Mr. Eayrs wishes to make, and makes, is that the letters, published or unpublished, are not simply copied into this book, but edited. Is it possible to give any idea of what that means? Take the most momentous letter of all, the letter written on October 30, 1738, to his brother Samuel, in which he tells of his conversion to God and what it signifies. The editing consists of three paragraphs, the first paragraph an encouragement to the reader to read, the second a description of the character of the letter, the third an account of the place, time, and circumstances.

Of the letter itself this much may be quoted. It is most pertinent to our own present necessities:

'With regard to my own character, and my doctrine likewise, I shall answer you very plainly. By a Christian I mean one who so believes in Christ as that sin hath no more dominion over him: and in this obvious sense of the word I was not a Christian until May the 24th last past. For till then sin had the dominion over me, although I fought with it continually; but surely, then, from that time to this it hath not—such is the free grace of God in Christ. What sins they were which till then reigned over me, and from which, by the grace of God, I am now free, I am ready to declare on the house-top, if it may be for the glory of God.

'If you ask by what means I am made free (though not perfect, neither infallibly sure of my perseverance), I answer, By faith in Christ; by such a sort or degree of faith as I had not till that day. My desire of this faith I knew long before, though not so clearly till Sunday, January the 8th last, when, being in the midst of the great deep, I wrote a few lines, in the bitterness of my soul, some of which I have transcribed; and may the good God sanctify them both to you and me!'

The C.M.S.

The Centenary of the Church Missionary Society was held in April 1899. In the same year Dr. Eugene Stock published *The History of the Church Missionary Society*, in three great handsome volumes. He has now issued a supplementary volume, the fourth, giving the history of the Society in the last sixteen years (C.M.S. ; 7s. 6d. net).

The interest of the volume—great in itself, greater than that of any one of the preceding volumes—is not a little increased by the circumstance that the war has invaded some of the countries where C.M.S. missionaries are at work. There is Mesopotamia, for example. How bitter have been our thoughts, and for that matter how bitter our words, about the loss of life there and the sufferings of our troops. But listen to this record of human loss, every life that of an educated devoted missionary and all without a murmur! ‘Turkish Arabia,’ says Dr. Stock, ‘as Mesopotamia has been officially called, appeared for the first time as an independent Mission in the Centenary year. Another of its cities, Mosul on the Tigris, near the site of ancient Nineveh, from which an American Mission had lately retired, was to be occupied as soon as possible, also, like Baghdad, for medical work; and this plan was carried out in 1901.’

Then he continues: ‘For the last six years Baghdad has had a woman doctor, Miss S. E. Hill, M.B., B.S.(Lond.), a daughter of the late Bishop Hill of West Africa. One of the clerical missionaries there for a time, Mr. Parfit, claimed to have ridden the first bicycle ever seen in Mesopotamia (1901), which he thought “deserved to be put on the roll of C.M.S. agents for the service it had rendered to the missionary cause.” Other missionaries, men and women, have served for a time, but the climate has again and again shortened their periods of work.’ The first lady sent out, Miss Valpy, had died before our sixteen years began, and so had the wife of Mr. Parfit. Miss Kelsey also died of cholera in 1904. Miss Lavy, a trained nurse, was drowned on her voyage out after furlough, in 1910, through the ship foundering off the Scilly Isles. An Australian lady had to be sent home seriously ill; but another lady sent from Australia in 1896, Miss Martin, who had previously worked some years in Palestine under the F.E.S., has continued to this day, and so has

Miss Butlin, who went out in 1900. Indeed, it may be said that upon these two ladies has fallen a large part of the burdens of both stations during the whole of our period, they being the only two missionaries on the staff all the time. The staff now comprises two clergymen, the Rev. E. E. Lavy, who retired for a time to qualify as a doctor, and the Rev. P. V. Boyes; Drs. Johnson and Stanley; three wives, and five other women.’

And what cheer have they had? Listen to Dr. Stock again. ‘This Mission, like others in Mohammedan countries, is emphatically one of faith. Its good influence upon the people is unmistakable, and its beneficent treatment of bodily ills is highly appreciated, but conversions are few. The courage and zeal of some, however, have cheered the missionaries, as in the case of a man baptized as far back as 1891, to whom the Turks, having failed to shake his faith by imprisonment, gave a military appointment with a good salary, in the vain hope of succeeding that way. Meanwhile, the bookshop has put forth the Scriptures and other Christian books, so in one form or another Christ is preached, and therein we may rejoice. Of one of the Christian catechists, Abbo Hasso, who died early in 1915, Miss Martin wrote, “He was universally respected for his absolute faithfulness, not only by the Christians of all sects, but by the Moslems and Jews. His name will always be honoured for his sincere devotion to his Lord and Saviour.”’

The Great Assize.

From beginning to end, Mr. W. Swift Rollings’ book *The Great Assize* (Allenson; 3s. 6d. net) is an indictment of war, a persistent, merciless, overwhelming denunciation. Even in the Old Testament Mr. Rollings will give war no place but a bad one. Was David a man of war? The disasters which came upon him were due to it, due to his having left the pastoral life at Bethlehem in the early days to join Saul’s military staff.

‘The Psalter, which for ever will bear David’s name, does not take its rise from David’s blood-stained throne; it springs up from the well of his Bethlehem life. Its chief song is of Jehovah as the Shepherd of His flock. And in sundry other songs we are told that a king is not delivered by the multitude of a host, nor a mighty man by his great strength; we learn also from the Psalter to

think of Jehovah as He who breaks the spear asunder, and burns the war chariot in the fire, and makes wars to cease unto the ends of the earth. And through it we also get a vision of God scattering the men who delight in war, and of a coming kingdom of peace.' _____

Making Peace Interesting.

To make peace attractive is to bless men beyond belief. The Rev. L. George Buchanan, M.A., Vicar of Holy Trinity, Hull, has written 'Preliminaries of Reconstruction,' under the title *After the War* (S.P.C.K.; 1s. 6d. net). This is how he would make peace interesting.

"What is wrong with peace," says a writer in the *North American Review*, "is that it is so aimless; it fails to interest the average man." This is somewhat startling to us whose ideals are, to say the least of it, peaceful; we are apt, in our British way, to set it down as "American"; but as the writer proceeds you begin to see what he means. Peace, he thinks, will never attract mankind as much as war does, for war brings out certain qualities in a way that peace (in his opinion) never can. Here, for instance, are some of them:

INTENSITY OF PURPOSE,
SACRIFICE OF SELF,
UNITY OF METHOD,

gathering themselves up into a *concentration of aim* that he says is bound to make life interesting to the average man.

'Let it be granted as true that the intensity and sacrifice shown to-day by thousands is magnificent, even if the unity of method is not (as yet) quite so obvious. Still, it does not prove that it is war as such that gives life its greatest interest. Some wars we have known brought division to a nation's ranks (memory still recalls what were called pro-Boers and the opposite); other wars were in themselves the dividing of the nation (we still record in history the red rose of Lancaster and the white rose of York). In any case many other items in life's experience produce exactly the same qualities as those above mentioned. A General Election, for instance, produces intensity of purpose (in the candidates), sacrifice of self (in the supporters), unity of method (in the party). Or, to be more topical, a Zeppelin raid without doubt produces them all in even a greater degree. Who, that has been through one, fails to note the intensity of

purpose by which we seek shelter from the bombs, the splendid self-sacrifice by which special constables protect us, and women control themselves for the sake of the children; while the unity of method also is remarkable (it would be amusing were it not serious), how every one talks of the same topic and every one agrees in demanding adequate protection for non-combatants in raided areas!

'Now, why do they produce all these results? Because there is an overmastering motive acting for a short time: patriotism in one case, danger in the other. But it is acting only for a time. If General Elections were always on they would lose their thrill; if Zeppelins were always dropping bombs we should become hardened like the men at the Front.

'Thus, quite seriously, it seems to me it is not war, as such, that produces these fine effects. "War," as such, "is Hell"; war, as the Germans wage it, is "Hell with the lid off!" What produces the effects above mentioned is a master-motive temporarily applied; and what we need for peace times is a motive for life equally overmastering, but applicable with permanent force. Has humanity got such a motive? Has humanity ever conceived an overwhelming reason for existence, a motive that will thrill the long recuperative periods of history when there is no war, a motive that will transfigure life and not dislocate it; interest, and even enthrall, mankind without exhausting it?

'Has humanity got this? Of course she has, she has the only motive that can really master mankind in a permanent sense, and that is the love and service of Christ. "The love of Christ overmasters us," said the Apostle; the challenge to the modern Church is whether first of all she has this love herself, and then whether she can capture humanity with it. So War, flushed with success, says to a Church bewildered not a little to-day, "I can captivate the universal mind; can you? I can commandeer the willing service of humanity; can you?" It is a serious challenge, not lightly to be answered in view of the obvious failure in so many directions.

'The only answer possible seems to be this: the Church as she ought to be could do it, the Church as she is cannot do it, but the Church as, please God, she will be can do it, and is determined to see that she does.'

The Second Advent: The Fact of it.

BY THE REV. R. G. MACINTYRE, B.D., PROFESSOR OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY IN ST. ANDREW'S COLLEGE (UNIVERSITY OF SYDNEY), SYDNEY.

It is not possible to read the New Testament and remain in any doubt that the first disciples started upon their ministry of Evangelization filled with the 'blessed hope' that Jesus would reappear again, this time in heavenly power and glory, to consummate the Kingdom. And it was a definite event to which they, and with them the early Church, looked forward; the consummation of a process, if you will, but an event standing out clear as a hill from the plain around it and of which yet the hill is but the upheaval. The distinction between 'process' and 'event' is valid, but to make an impassable gulf between them is utterly unscientific. I cannot conceive of an event divorced from process. Development is teleological, and the event when it does come may break forth with cataclysmic suddenness. An iceberg which has been slowly melting suddenly heels over and assumes a new centre of gravity. There is nothing unreasonable or even improbable in the conception of a spiritual Kingdom, present in some measure already, and some time to break in with intensified power on the existing order of things, a moral and spiritual Kingdom whose manifestation is dependent upon the will of God and conditioned by the faith of the Church. Further, to believe that the glory of the Kingdom will not be separate from Him who is its King, and through whom it has become possible, is so natural that it is difficult to think of it otherwise. The King is greater than the Kingdom, for He is the Creator of it, and only in the manifestation of the King can the full glory of the Kingdom be known. It involves such a personal manifestation of Jesus as will make all men know that this is indeed the 'Day' of the Son of Man, when the Saviour-Judge completes His work on earth. We must not take the Biblical representation of the event as more than symbolism of what is beyond human imagination; for it is imagination that is baffled in this event, not faith or reason. When we read of 'clouds' and 'trumpets' and 'thrones' we are dealing with mere scenery, scenery manifestly carried over from the Old Testament and from Apocalyptic literature. To take all this as a

photographic picture of what the Second Advent will be like is peculiarly inept, and is to commit, in an exaggerated degree, the blunder of Jewish literalists. The strange thing is that just here, where we are so manifestly dealing with picture-language, literalism has been most dogmatic. On the other hand, one has to guard against interpreting the language in such a way as to blot out the picture altogether. It seems to me that all we are warranted in saying, as belonging to faith, is that at some future time our Lord will manifest His personal presence in power, and that this Parousia will mark the end of the present age, and the beginning of a new age in which every power shall be subject to God, 'a new heaven and a new earth,' that is, an absolutely new condition of things; and that, however the work of the Church may lead up to it and prepare for it, the bringing in of this new age will be in a very special sense the work of God through Jesus Christ. It will mark a definite stage in God's redemptive purpose, for the *primary* purpose of the Second Advent is redemption, not judgment.

Christ's first Advent, while an historic event, was, in almost every respect, different from the highly coloured pictures of the prophets. The prophecy of His coming was true, but the prophetic picture was no photograph of the reality. Not a palace but the home of a carpenter sheltered Him. He was reared not in the Holy City but in despised Nazareth; not luxury but homelessness was His fate, not a royal progress but the *via dolorosa*, not a throne but a cross. Yet when He did come, so disappointingly different from the pen portraits of the prophetic Messiah, He proved a greater King than any prophet had dreamed, and He entered upon a Kingdom far exceeding their utmost flight of imagination. So, we may assume, will it be in His Second Advent. It will surprise us in its manner, it will shame our literalism, but it will exceed our highest thoughts in its moral glory and its spiritual significance. And it will leave us in no doubt that it is the Coming of the Son of Man to take unto Himself the Kingdom which is His at so great a cost. The earth will undergo

great changes, possibly passing altogether from its present form and conditions. I do not believe that we can even imagine the manner of all this, for we cannot get beyond human experience, and this event will be without parallel in human experience. Faith and reason can accept it, but imagination cannot rise to the height of it. It is vain to pick out this or that detail in a picture painted in borrowed colours. It may be that not a single colouring in the picture will be reproduced in the actual event. But that does not imply that the picture has lied, for the picture is not alien to the event. I happen to have before me a picture of a Union Jack with 'a beautifully ugly' bull-dog standing upon it and looking out upon the English Channel. To me, in my far Australian home, that picture is not alien to the actual facts of this year of war. The symbolism of the New Testament does convey an idea we can apprehend even if we cannot comprehend it, and therefore we hope to the end for the grace that is to be brought to us at the Parousia of Jesus Christ.

Now, is the event proclaimed in the New Testament and wrought into the faith of the Church so improbable that the right-minded Christian is he who puts it aside as childish? Allowing for some faultiness of apprehension on the part of the first disciples, due to preconceived notions, it is simply not credible that the main import of the eschatological teaching has not the authority of Jesus behind it. That teaching expresses a certain outlook upon life and a certain idea of God's relationship to the world which is either fundamentally right or fundamentally wrong. But Jesus' general outlook upon life was singularly clear, sane, and ethical, and there is no reason to credit Him here with lapsing into the rôle of the ecstatic visionary. The material aspects of the change foretold are of secondary importance. They are only the framework of the picture. Yet they are there, and who will say that they are improbable? Other planets have undergone as great and cataclysmic changes as are pictured of our own. Some worlds have had a slow ending, others a sudden end. Most scientists will say that something like this must happen, though they cannot predict what will emerge from the event. Scientific imagination sees nothing improbable in great and sudden physical changes, affecting a whole world. Now, can any one take upon himself to say that these far-reaching changes

in the world of nature will not coincide with some moral manifestation of God of a hitherto unique character. Are not the two ideas quite consonant? And believing that Jesus Christ was God manifest in the flesh, is it not reasonable to credit that this revelation of the Divine will be through Him who is Son of God and Son of Man? We cannot regard history aright unless we regard it from the ethical point of view. And if the ethical point of view is essential to a right understanding of the history of individuals and of nations, is it not also the right point of view when we regard the world as a whole? Granted the ethical point of view, how can you escape an eschatology? The more intensely ethical a religion is, the more essential to it is its eschatology. Represent it to ourselves how we may, the essentially ethical character of Christianity demands the final victory for righteousness, and the hope of such victory rests primarily not upon man but upon the direct action of God. Eschatology, and particularly the Second Advent, thus becomes a part of the Gospel, without which it is not "the whole Gospel." That the victory is so closely related to the Person of Christ seems essential to Christianity, for it is the completion or consummation of His work of redemption. That it will involve a personal manifestation of Christ (the manner of which is secondary) is surely nothing to stumble at. This is the essential thing in the eschatology of the New Testament, and when it was attempted to present this faith, even the rich language and symbolism of the prophets was too inadequate. What I would here press is that the eschatology of the New Testament, and very specially the doctrine of the Second Advent, must not be separated from the ethical side of our religion. At the back of the doctrine of the Second Advent lies the conviction that it is not ethical to assume that good and evil will continue forever balancing one another. A permanent dualism is not completely ethical. A God of Righteousness means that some day righteousness will prevail as a world-order. And the victory must be where the battle is. Sin has challenged righteousness here, and it is here that Christ

A second Adam to the fight,
And to the rescue, came.

That work has yet to be completed, and completed by Him who began it. It is His work. It must be seen to be His victory. How we would repre-

sent to ourselves that final personal victory of Christ had we no Biblical literature to guide us I know not, but we would have to find some picture of it, and in whatever frame we set it and with whatever colours we painted it, the message, in its essentials, could be no other than that of the New Testament. Christ has set a-going in the world a great ethical and religious movement. That fact belongs to history. He will see it through, and the final victory will not be apart from His Presence (*παρουσία*) in the world. On these ethical and religious grounds it is easy to understand the eager expectancy of the early Church, persecuted on every side and faced with what seemed an overwhelming power of evil. Not knowing the patience or the power of God, it seemed to the Church that if victory was to come it must come soon, therefore she cried, "Even so, come, Lord Jesus." The Church of to-day cannot give up that hope. Does not Christian faith imply and involve a teleology inseparable from the person of Jesus Christ? Even those Christians who suppose

that they have relegated this question to the region of the indifferent find, when they face the problem of the world order, that they must fall back upon this hope, though, as a rule, it is so vague that it is of little practical service. Yet in so far as the Church loses the vision and the power of this hope, faith lies like a bird with a broken wing. Through this hope the Church is made to feel, more impressively than would be otherwise possible, that she is not left alone to face the battle. The battle is the Lord's. And thus the Church gains the seal of assurance, for it is a 'sure hope,' that she is gaining nearer to victory. The golden age of the Church lies not in the past, but in the future. She is not passing into the night, but towards the day that knows no night. Because the Lord is coming again the Church must prevail, even against 'the gates of hell,' and the note of victory never dies on her lips. The light ahead is no will-o'-the-wisp, but the Sun of Righteousness. It is the Sun rising behind the cross and the empty grave. Christ, not Nietzsche, will conquer.

Contributions and Comments.

Psalm cx. 3.

THIS is perhaps the most difficult verse in the Psalter. Shall we say, in the Bible? Every student knows how the ancient versions and the modern commentators leave the reader in greater bewilderment. Perhaps a clearer conception of one phrase in the verse may lead the way to the interpretation of the whole.

Some person, or some thing, is *of or more than* or *from the womb of the morning*. I would suggest that the *womb of the morning* is the dayspring, the bursting forth of the sun in the eastern sky, which disperses the darkness of night, the mists and clouds of sunless earth.

If this be right, we find a parallel in another prophecy (Mal 4²): 'Unto you that fear my name shall the Sun of righteousness arise with healing in his wings (= beams, rays).'

We sometimes find allusions to a type or figure, running like a connecting thread through many books of Holy Scripture, from early Hebrew to New Testament times. The figure of marriage is a well-known instance of this.

So the sun and the sunrise (Ps 84¹¹) picture out the uncreated 'Light of the world' (Ps 4⁶ 27¹ 36⁹ etc., Is 9² 42⁶ 49⁶ 60¹ etc., Lk 2³², Jn 1⁴⁻⁹ 9⁵ 12⁴⁴, Rev 21²³ 22⁵). The contrasted darkness (Jn 1⁵ 3¹⁹). There is progress in the use of these figures.

The expression '*womb of the morning*' for the sunrise, finds a (perhaps unintended) parallel in Keble's lines:

'Hues of the rich unfolding morn,
That, ere the glorious sun be *born*.'

שֶׁחֶר is, of course, the *early dawn*, which agrees with the above view, and רֶחֶם is clearly *womb*, though, as *Oxf. Heb. Lex.* suggests, the usual שֶׁחֶר may be the correct form also here, the ט being a dittograph from the preceding word.

The R.V. margin, 'Thy youth are to thee as dew,' is the most probable version of the next clause of all I have seen, and would be certain if טָל stood prefixed to שֶׁחֶר. But the ellipsis of טָל is not unusual, e.g. Ps 14⁴. The suggestion made in *Oxf. Heb. Lex.* 378^b, 'with flashing weapons like

dewdrops,' requires too much to be supplied mentally. Sunrise and morning dew are connected together.

Has the π been lost through the preceding η ?

GEORGE FARMER.

Wellesley House, Walmer.

Discipleship.

ONE of the most familiar terms for the Christian is 'disciple' (learner), and yet certain phases of N.T. usage are noteworthy.

1. The substantive, *μαθητής*, is found almost everywhere in the Gospels from Mt 5¹ to Jn 21²⁴.

2. It is also frequent in Acts as an appropriate term for followers of Christ: cf. *μαθήτρια*, 9³⁶, 'female disciple.'

3. And yet it is never once found in the Epistles and Apocalypse. Why is this?

4. The cognate verb, *μαθητεύω*, is used in the active and passive: (a) active, 'make disciples' (Mt 28¹⁹, Ac 14²¹); (b) passive, 'to be disciples of' (Mt 13⁵², kingdom; Mt 27⁵⁷, Jesus).

5. The verb, *μανθάνω*, 'to learn,' is used fairly frequently in the Epistles in connexion with Christians: Ro 16¹⁷, *διδαχὴν*; Eph 4²⁰, *τὸν Χριστόν*; cf. Ph 4¹¹, 1 Ti 2¹¹ 5⁴, 2 Ti 3¹⁴. See also *καταμανθάνω*, Mt 6²⁸.

6. The English word 'discipline' has come to mean 'moral training,' but originally meant 'learning' (*disciplina*). How suggestive is the idea that we obtain 'discipline' through 'discipleship' (cf. He 5⁸, *ἐμαθεν ἀφ' ὧν ἔπαθε τὴν ὑπακοήν*).

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.

Toronto.

The Reception of Onesimus by Philemon.

It would be interesting to know what reception Onesimus received, and how Philemon treated him. Lightfoot says, 'of the result of this appeal we have no certain knowledge. It is reasonable to suppose, however, that Philemon would not belie the Apostle's hopes,' etc. Referring to the letter, Deissmann says, 'this gem, the preservation of which we owe to some fortunate accident.'

Can we not argue this—that our possession of the letter is proof of the favourable reception and treatment of Onesimus by Philemon?

The letter was strictly private. Onesimus would know its purport, but not the details of its contents. The only one who could make public the letter was its recipient, Philemon. If he had refused the Apostle's request, would he have made known that request? If Philemon did as Paul wished, then he would have been willing for others to see the letter from the beloved Apostle. The letter may have been copied. This would lessen the chance of its accidental preservation. Philemon had it in his power to suppress the letter or to make it known. Would he have made it known if he had disobeyed it? Can we not use as an argument for the favourable reception and treatment of Onesimus the fact that we know the letter to Philemon?

ERNEST F. KNIGHT.

Calcutta.

Judas Iscariot.

To the literature concerning Judas Iscariot may well be added the thrilling 'Ballad of Judas Iscariot,' by Robert Buchanan. It has been called the greatest ballad since the 'Ancient Mariner.' Its picture of the Repentance of Judas and his welcome and forgiveness by the Saviour is of notable beauty and power.

FRANCIS L. PALMER.

Stillwater, Minnesota.

'Touch me not.'

DOES not the difficulty that has been felt with this passage grow out of inaccuracy of translation?

The verb means 'lay hold of,' 'handle,' 'cling,' or the like. Its distinction from *τίγῃς* is clearly seen in Col 2²¹, where also A.V. has gone wrong. The tense *ἄπτον* tells us that Jesus is forbidding the continuance of an action that is going on. So we may translate: 'Do not be clinging to me.'

It is therefore quite gratuitous to say that Jesus forbids to Mary what He commands in the case of Thomas, and then to begin searching for reasons. He did not forbid her to touch Him. She did more than touch. She possibly did just what the other women did—'they took hold of his feet, and worshipped him' (Mt 28⁹). In neither case did He prevent. He did, however, forbid the undue continuance of the action.

Why? The simplest reason is probably the best.

Mary's act not only expresses her joy at His return, but betrays her mistaken idea that the going and returning of which He spoke is now completely fulfilled, that He will now remain with them. That misconception Jesus removes in the same kind way in which He meets the honest perplexity of Thomas. We too should have felt the kindness of it had we heard the tone in which the words were uttered. So He tells her He is not back to stay, that He has not yet gone up to the Father, but that He is to go shortly. Meantime He bids her, as He did the other women, to go and tell His brethren that He wishes to see and speak with them before He returns to the Father.

J. H. FARMER.

McMaster University,
Toronto, Canada.

Ἰησοῦς Χριστός in Acts.

IN his interesting article on 'Acts' in the *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, Professor Lake says that Χριστός is always predicative, except in the phrase τὸ ὄνομα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, and that Ἰησοῦς Χριστός is not used as a name, save in that phrase. This is not quite correct. In 9³⁴ St. Peter says, Αἰνέα, ἰάταί σε Ἰησοῦς Χριστός. It may be conjectured that the combination Ἰησοῦς Χριστός was used in the healing of the sick (cf. 3⁶ 4¹⁰ 16¹⁸). In regard to the employment of the words τὸ ὄνομα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ in baptism (2⁸⁸ 10⁴⁸), we may compare the remarkable phrase in the Epistle of St. James (which probably refers to baptism), [βλασφημοῦσιν] τὸ καλὸν ὄνομα τὸ ἐπικληθὲν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς (2⁷).

H. W. FULFORD.

Crowmarsh Rectory, Oxon.

Mazoud the Bedouin.¹

OF late years much has been written on various aspects of Eastern life, but rarely will one find so sympathetic a presentation as in Mrs. Carhart's fascinating tales. A daughter of Dr. Post, so long and honourably associated with the Protestant College of Beirut, born under Syrian skies, familiar from infancy with the native language and ways, a warm friend of the people to whom she dedicates her book, she writes from the heart and to the

¹ By Alfreda Post Carhart. *Missionary Education Movement of the United States and Canada*: New York, 1915.

heart. The stories are almost all based on incidents of Syrian life, but they have the touch which distinguishes literature from mere chronicle. They are pervaded throughout by the atmosphere of the East, its dazzling sunshine and gorgeous moons, its rich green valleys, rugged steeps and shimmering sands, the low, black tents of the Bedouin, and the ever-shifting colours of the village streets and bazaars. The characters who flit across the stage, too, are typical Easterners, such as one finds in the classic pages of the Old Testament—the proud Bedouin, swift to avenge the life or honour of his kinsfolk, yet curiously moved by impulses of generosity and devotion; the careless shepherd boy, tending his flocks, and whiling away the weary hours with pipe and song; the maiden awaking to love, with its unknown possibilities of joy and pain; and the mother crooning over the child of her hopes, or rending the heavens with lamentations for the death of her hero. A strange commingling of comedy and tragedy! But through it all steals the sweet music of the Sheffaka, the everlasting compassion, which appeals equally to East and West. As we read how this Compassion, made real through the tender ministrations of Christian teacher, pastor, physician, and nurse, melts the hearts of fierce Bedouin warriors, impelling them to deeds of gentleness and love, or trace its leavening influence in hospital and school, we can look forward with new hopefulness to a time when East shall meet with West, and together yield their crowns to Him who is Lord of both.

ALEX. R. GORDON.

Presbyterian College, Montreal.

'Henotheism' and Schelling.

A WRITER of high standing, Dr. Edward Lehmann, in a recent authoritative publication (*Die Kultur der Gegenwart*, Teil i. Abteilung iii.² 1913, p. 16), speaks of "relative monotheism" or "henotheism" as constituting, according to Schelling, the primary origin of religion, and adds that 'Schelling's scholar, Max Müller,' the 'founder of the modern study of the History of Religion,' recognized Henotheism—the worship of one god at a time—as the earliest stage in the religion of the Vedas.

While Lehmann does not definitely affirm that Schelling employs the word Henotheism, his inverted commas do their utmost to instil that

belief. But, so far as the present writer can discover, the impression is false. Chantepie de la Saussaye (*Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*², 1897, vol. i. p. 16) is more guarded: '*If not the word*' henotheism, 'yet the thought must be traced to Schelling, who assumed a relative monotheism as the principle of the original unity of the human race.' Two more sentences may be given from de la Saussaye, as they state Schelling's view clearly and well. 'This relative monotheism recognizes only one God; but this unity is accidental, not essential; hence a second god may easily be associated with the first; or, on the other hand, relative monotheism may purify itself into monotheism proper. Thus relative monotheism is the primary stage in religion, and the starting-point both of monotheistic and polytheistic developments.'

Schelling has (at least) two discussions of 'Mythology'—an older 'Introduction to the Philosophy of Mythology,' and a later 'Philosophy of Mythology.' The summary just quoted refers to Lecture VI. of the earlier discussion, the 'Introduction'—not, as loosely stated in Baldwin's *Dic. of Philos.*, art. 'Henotheism,' to the 'Philosophy of Mythology.' When the later lecturers resume the

subject, Schelling styles the relative monotheism of the primitive mind mere 'Theism.' He does not use the term 'Henotheism,' which would have been in its place here if anywhere. Can he have used it at all? Surely not.

Lastly, Max Müller claims the term as his own; cf. the quotation in *E.R.E.*, art. 'Monolatry and Henotheism.'

ROBERT MACKINTOSH.

Manchester.

Genesis iii. 22.

A FRIEND, of long ago, once wrote to me as follows:—

'Did I ever mention to you my idea as to how Gn 3²² might be cleared of a difficulty, by translating הָיָה *was* instead of *has become*? A few days back I met with the same view in a French writer of some note—Grandpierre. Man was created in the image of God, and *was as* the Creator with regard to knowing good and evil: but by his sin, he lost this likeness.'

It would be very interesting to learn whether Hebraists consider the suggested rendering to be in any way possible.

W. COLLINS.

Nunnington.

Entre Nous.

Adelaide Eden Phillpotts.

The gift of imagination has descended in the Eden Phillpotts family to the second generation. Miss Adelaide Eden Phillpotts is a poet. The finest poem in *Illyrion, and other Poems* (Palmer & Hayward; 1s. 6d. net) is the poem which gives the book its title, and it is very fine indeed. The delicately handled introduction is particularly pleasing. Dreams, moonbeams, shadows, dawn, morning, cloud, flower-fays, showers, rainbow-spirits, life, come and go with delightful lightness of touch, and lead us, well pleased, into the presence of Illyrion and his serious quest. Let us quote the passage which gives the conclusion of the whole matter:

Progress is like the inflowing tide, whose waves
Sweep forward, then recede a little way,
Only to advance again a little more
And cover the last imprint that they made.

Though the vast wave of progress should recede
In our brief generation, yet again
Will it flow forward after we are gone.
Less than a moment of eternity
Is this, thy little life. Fear not, oh, son,
And be not disappointed in thy kind,
Because they shame thy spirit for a while—
Humanity is yet but as a child,
And children must be fighting with their fists,
For their young minds have not th' experience
To solve each difference that will arise.
The days are not yet come when man shall claim
For motherland the kingdom of mankind;
But he has many a million years to live,
So fear not that in some far-distant age
All Earth will be to him as home; and race
Will be no longer as a barrier.
Look to the present now, and be thou brave,
Trust thy great mother, Nature, and go fight
For thy dear country and for Liberty.

Edith Anne Stewart.

Pilgrimage and Battle is an accurate title for the poems of Edith Anne Stewart (Headley; 3s. 6d. net). They are poems of life's experience, and the war has made the experiences of life more wonderful. There is boundless hope, because there is fathomless faith. But neither faith nor hope removes the mystery. What shall be done, for example, to the slayer of Edith Cavell?

Vengeance is Mine, saith the Lord, I will repay—
*O mine enemy, somewhere God keepeth for thee
 Anguish more bitter than this thou hast poured
 on me,
 Payment more dreadful than I could devise to-day.*

Nay, saith the Lord, your way is not My Way,
 My Vengeance is not yours; who hath eyes
 to see

Lift them up to where Jesus hangs on a tree,
 This is the sum of My Vengeance, thus I repay.

And Hell, saith God, is the hour ye shall wake
 and know

What ye have done to Me. But now ye sleep:
 Hate hath nothing could move you, rage no blow
 Could stir those palsied souls to wake and weep.

But I have ordained that Love shall bid you rise
 From sleep to Hell, from Hell to Paradise.

F. W. Orde Ward.

The years of the War will have their mark on English literature. Three years of War poetry will be conspicuous for all time to come in the histories of the literature of the world. And one of the poets named will be Mr. Orde Ward. He has written little and he has written that little nearly in one metre. But it is true poetry. The title of the book is *The Last Crusade* (Kelly). This is an example:

THE MIRACULOUS ARMIES.

Fools deem the age of miracles is dead,
 But we behold them
 Daily, and hear once more God's awful tread;
 He marcheth with us to the battle-line
 In power divine,
 He ranks our forces and His arms enfold them,
 His love their wine and sacramental bread.
 The greatest and the least,
 They each are summoned to the Bridegroom's feast.

What were the single purpose but His call,
 The Spirit's leading
 That lifts by many a broken heart and fall?
 The dry bones live again, the very tomb
 Becomes a womb
 Of soldiers who obey the country's pleading
 And form new resurrection's iron wall.
 Yea, out of quickened dust
 We see the rifle rise, the sword-blade's thrust.

Where once were only furze and stubborn thorn
 Or thwart stern thistle,
 Here peaceful flocks or there the huntsman's
 horn:

Rings out the bugle with its challenge grave
 Across the wave,
 The khaki grows like weeds, the bayonets bristle,
 From every silent bush a man is born.
 As though the labouring earth
 Were but a cradle for fresh empire's birth.

We hear the sharpening of the sword, the cry
 Of martial orders,
 And see proud forms that move as destiny;
 One mind, one mouth, one settled purpose runs
 Along the guns,
 The horse and foot that burst imprisoning
 borders
 And raiseth hearts to deeds of chivalry.
 As if the flowing tide
 Had come to help its Queen, in subject pride.

Stirs the whole nation to the trumpet peal
 Beyond mere fashion,
 That sets on every brow a glorious seal;
 The slumbering giant from him rudely shakes
 Fetters, and wakes
 To discipline of calm and bridled passion,
 While all are brothers for the common weal.
 Onward the movement swings,
 For freedom, to the playing-ground of kings.

Arthur Shearly Cripps.

Mr. Cripps sends home from Lake Victoria Nyanza a volume of passionate poems, calling it *Pilgrim's Joy* (Blackwell; 2s. 6d. net). They are passionate for the world of nature and the liberty of man. The scenes described are unfamiliar and yet familiar—it is the one human heart that sees them. The passion for liberty—even to the African—is sometimes scornful of tyranny.

RIZPAH IN S. AFRICA.

(A colonist mother keening for her child. See the old-world story in 2 Sam. 21.)

The thing that hath been, it shall be,
There is no new thing, no not one;
Would God that I had died for thee,
My son, my son!

Even as Aiah's child of old,
I breathe to yon blue smiling sky
My curse upon the Gibeonites
Who made him die.

Who hewed the logs, who drew at well,
More patient than the beasts they drave,
Whose patience asked those gifts of wrong
His father gave—

No one day's blood-writ crime to make
The sun o'er Gibeon stand aghast,
But breach on breach, and guile on guile
These long years past.

Therefore our boy so clean of sin
Lies here before the Lord so low,
And I, a stone beside a stone,
Watch out my woe.

Aldous Huxley.

The Burning Wheel (Blackwell; 2s. net) is one of the 'Adventures All' series, and it is an adventure. There is nothing that will stay, nothing that is meant to stay. Moods and impressions, cleverly caught and expressed in clever words, with just once or twice a deeper note—that is the little book. There is a deeper note in

DARKNESS.

My close-walled soul has never known
That innermost darkness, dazzling sight,
Like the blind point, whence the visions spring
In the core of the gazer's chrysolite . . .
The mystic darkness that laps God's throne
In a splendour beyond imagining,
So passing bright.

But the many twisted darknesses
That range the city to and fro,
In aimless subtlety pass and part
And ebb and glutinously flow;
Darkness of lust and avarice,
Of the crippled body and the crooked heart . . .
These darknesses I know.

John Oxenham.

Mr. Oxenham's new book is called *The King's High Way* (Methuen; 1s. net). It is after the manner of *Bees in Amber* and *All's Well*, and the manner is as attractive as ever. Perhaps it is a little more 'warlike'; perhaps it is also a little more 'religious,' for things grow more not less serious as the certainty of victory comes in sight. It contains also some hymns for the time of peace that is coming. We shall quote two of the more 'religious' poems.

ELDER BROTHER.

Now, God be thanked that our dear Lord became
Man, like us men!—
Subject to man's infirmities,
But without stain.

He suffered in our frail humanity
The Cross, the pain,—
To teach us that from earthly loss
Comes heavenly gain.

We could not look on Thy full glory, Lord,
Nor bear the light.
So Wisdom veiled the Light with Love,
To suit our sight.

Dear Elder Brother, to our succour sent,—
Light clothed in Love,—
For our souls' full enfranchisement
To joys above!

PETITION.

O Grant me this,—
In all my work,
Lord, of Thy best!—
High thought in true word drest,
To cheer, to lift,—
To comfort the depressed,—
To lighten darkness,—
To bring rest
To souls distressed.
In all my work, O manifest
Thy Will!
So shall the work be blest.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works,
and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street,
Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.